Phenomenology of charmed mesons in the extended Linear Sigma Model

Walaa I. Eshraim[1], Francesco Giacosa[1,2], and Dirk H. Rischke[1]
[1] *Institute for Theoretical Physics, Goethe University, Max-von-Laue-Str. 1, D–60438 Frankfurt am Main, Germany and*
[2] *Institute of Physics, Jan Kochanowski University, 25-406 Kielce, Poland*

We study the so-called extended linear sigma model for the case of four quark flavors. This model is based on global chiral symmetry and dilatation invariance and includes, besides scalar and pseudoscalar mesons, vector and axial-vector mesons. Most of the parameters of the model have been determined in previous work by fitting properties of mesons with three quark flavors. Only three new parameters, all related to the current charm quark mass, appear when introducing charmed mesons. Surprisingly, within the accuracy expected from our approach, the masses of open charmed mesons turn out to be in quantitative agreement with experimental data. On the other hand, with the exception of J/ψ, the masses of charmonia are underpredicted by about 10%. It is remarkable that our approach correctly predicts (within errors) the mass splitting between spin-0 and spin-1 negative-parity open charm states. This indicates that, although the charm quark mass breaks chiral symmetry quite strongly explicitly, this symmetry still seems to have some influence on the properties of charmed mesons.

PACS numbers: 12.39.Fe,12.40.Yx,13.25.Ft
Keywords: chiral Lagrangians, sigma model, charmed mesons

arXiv:1405.5861v2 [hep-ph] 22 Sep 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum chromodynamics (QCD) describes the fundamental interactions of quarks and gluons. However, due to confinement, in the low-energy domain the physical degrees of freedom are hadrons, i.e., mesons and baryons. In the last decades, effective low-energy approaches of the strong interaction have been developed by imposing chiral symmetry which is one of the basic symmetries of the QCD Lagrangian in the limit of vanishing quark masses (the so-called chiral limit) [1, 2]. Chiral symmetry is explicitly broken by the nonzero current quark masses, but it is also spontaneously broken by a nonzero quark condensate in the QCD vacuum [3]: as a consequence, pseudoscalar (quasi-)Goldstone bosons emerge. In a world with only u and d quarks, i.e., for $N_f = 2$ quark flavors, these are the pions, while for $N_f = 3$, i.e., when also the strange quark s is considered, the Goldstone modes comprise also kaons and the η meson besides the pions. [The η' meson is not a Goldstone boson because of the chiral anomaly [4, 5].]

Chiral symmetry can be realized in hadronic approaches in the so-called nonlinear or in the linear representation. In the nonlinear case, only the Goldstone bosons are considered [6, 7] [in recent extensions also vector mesons are added, see e.g. Ref. [8]]. On the contrary, in the linear case also the chiral partners of the Goldstone bosons, the scalar mesons, are retained [9–11]. When extending this approach to the vector sector, both vector and axial-vector mesons are present [10, 11]. Along this line, recent efforts have led to the construction of the so-called extended linear sigma model (eLSM), first for $N_f = 2$ [12–14] and then for $N_f = 3$ [15]. In the eLSM, besides chiral symmetry, a basic phenomenon of QCD in the chiral limit has been taken into account: the symmetry under dilatation transformation and its anomalous breaking (trace anomaly), see e.g. Ref. [16]. As a result, the eLSM Lagrangian contains only a *finite* number of terms. In the case $N_f = 3$ it was for the first time possible to describe (pseudo)scalar as well as (axial-)vector meson nonets in a chiral framework [15]: masses and decay widths turn out to be in very good agreement with the results listed by the Particle Data Group (PDG) [17].

In this work we investigate the eLSM model in the four-flavor case ($N_f = 4$), i.e., by considering mesons which contain at least one charm quark. This study is a straightforward extension of Ref. [15]: the Lagrangian has the same structure as in the $N_f = 3$ case, except that all (pseudo)scalar and (axial-)vector meson fields are now parametrized in terms of 4×4 (instead of 3×3) matrices. These now also include the charmed degrees of freedom. Since low-energy (i.e., nonstrange and strange) hadron phenomenology was described very well [15], we retain the values for the parameters that already appear in the three-flavor sector. Then, extending the model to $N_f = 4$, three additional parameters enter, all of which are related to the current charm quark mass (two of them in the (pseudo)scalar sector and one in the (axial-)vector sector).

Considering that the explicit breaking of chiral and dilatation symmetries by the current charm quark mass, $m_c \simeq 1.275$ GeV, is quite large, one may wonder whether it is at all justified to apply a model based on chiral symmetry. Rather, one would expect heavy-quark spin symmetry [18] to play the dominant role. Related to this, the charmed mesons entering our model have a mass up to about 3.5 GeV, i.e., they are strictly speaking no longer part of the low-energy domain of the strong interaction. Naturally, we do not expect to achieve the same precision

as refined potential models [19, 20], lattice-QCD calculations [21], and heavy-quark effective theories [18, 22–24] [see also the review of Ref. [25] and refs. therein]. Nevertheless, it is still interesting to see how a successful model for low-energy hadron phenomenology based on chiral symmetry and dilatation invariance fares when extending it to the high-energy charm sector. Quite surprisingly, a quantitative agreement with experimental values for the open charmed meson masses is obtained by fitting just the three additional parameters mentioned above (with deviations of the order of 150 MeV, i.e., $\sim 5\%$). On the other hand, with the exception of J/ψ, the charmonium states turn out to be about 10% too light when compared to experimental data. Nevertheless, the main conclusion is that it is, to first approximation, not unreasonable to delegate the strong breaking of chiral and dilatation symmetries to three mass terms only and still have chirally and dilatation invariant interaction terms. Moreover, our model correctly predicts the mass splitting between spin-0 and spin-1 negative-parity open charm states, i.e., naturally incorporates the right amount of breaking of the heavy-quark spin symmetry.

In addition to meson masses, we study the strong OZI-dominant decays of the heavy charmed states into light mesons. In this way, our model acts as a bridge between the high- and low-energy sector of the strong interaction. It turns out that the OZI-dominant decays are in qualitative agreement with current experimental results, although the theoretical uncertainties for some of them are still very large. Nevertheless, since our decay amplitudes depend on the parameters of the low-energy sector of the theory, there seems to be an important influence of chiral symmetry in the determination of the decay widths of charmed states. As a by-product of our analysis, we also obtain the value of the charm-anticharm condensate and the values of the weak decay constants of D mesons. Moreover, in the light of our results we shall discuss the interpretation of the enigmatic scalar strange-charmed meson $D_{S0}^*(2317)$ and the axial-vector strange-charmed mesons $D_{S1}(2460)$ and $D_{S1}(2536)$ [25–28].

This work is organized as follows: in Sec. 2 we present the eLSM for $N_f = 4$. In Sec. 3 we discuss the results for the masses and decay widths, and in Sec. 4 we give our conclusions. Details of the calculations are relegated to the Appendices. Our units are $\hbar = c = 1$, the metric tensor is $g^{\mu\nu} = \mathrm{diag}(+,-,-,-)$.

II. THE LAGRANGIAN OF THE ELSM FOR $N_f = 4$

In this section we extend the eLSM [14, 15, 29–31] to the four-flavor case. To this end, we introduce 4×4 matrices which contain, in addition to the usual nonstrange and strange mesons, also charmed states. The matrix of pseudoscalar fields P (with quantum numbers $J^{PC} = 0^{-+}$) reads

$$P = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\eta_N + \pi^0) & \pi^+ & K^+ & D^0 \\ \pi^- & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\eta_N - \pi^0) & K^0 & D^- \\ K^- & \overline{K}^0 & \eta_S & D_S^- \\ \overline{D}^0 & D^+ & D_S^+ & \eta_c \end{pmatrix} \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{u}\Gamma u & \bar{d}\Gamma u & \bar{s}\Gamma u & \bar{c}\Gamma u \\ \bar{u}\Gamma d & \bar{d}\Gamma d & \bar{s}\Gamma d & \bar{c}\Gamma d \\ \bar{u}\Gamma s & \bar{d}\Gamma s & \bar{s}\Gamma s & \bar{c}\Gamma s \\ \bar{u}\Gamma c & \bar{d}\Gamma c & \bar{s}\Gamma c & \bar{c}\Gamma c \end{pmatrix} , \tag{1}$$

where, for sake of clarity, we also show the quark-antiquark content of the mesons (in the pseudoscalar channel $\Gamma = i\gamma^5$). In the nonstrange-strange sector (the upper left 3×3 matrix) the matrix P contains the pion triplet $\vec{\pi}$, the four kaon states K^+, K^-, K^0, $\bar{K}^0$, and the isoscalar fields $\eta_N = \sqrt{1/2}(\bar{u}u + \bar{d}d)$ and $\eta_S = \bar{s}s$. The latter two fields mix and generate the physical fields η and η' [for details, see Ref. [15]]. In the charm sector (fourth line and fourth column) the matrix P contains the open charmed states D^+, D^-, D^0, $\bar{D}^0$, which correspond to the well-established D resonance, the open strange-charmed states $D_S^\pm$, and, finally, the hidden charmed state η_c, which represents the well-known pseudoscalar ground state charmonium $\eta_c(1S)$.

The matrix of scalar fields S (with quantum numbers $J^{PC} = 0^{++}$) reads

$$S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\sigma_N + a_0^0) & a_0^+ & K_0^{*+} & D_0^{*0} \\ a_0^- & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\sigma_N - a_0^0) & K_0^{*0} & D_0^{*-} \\ K_0^{*-} & \overline{K}_0^{*0} & \sigma_S & D_{S0}^{*-} \\ \overline{D}_0^{*0} & D_0^{*+} & D_{S0}^{*+} & \chi_{c0} \end{pmatrix} . \tag{2}$$

The quark-antiquark content is the same as in Eq. (1), but using $\Gamma = 1_4$. A long debate about the correct assignment of light scalar states has taken place in the last decades. Present results [32, 33], which have been independently confirmed in the framework of the eLSM [15], show that the scalar quarkonia have masses between 1-2 GeV. In particular, the isotriplet $\vec{a}_0$ is assigned to the resonance $a_0(1450)$ (and not to the lighter state $a_0(980)$). Similarly, the kaonic states K_0^{*+}, K_0^{*-}, K_0^{*+}, $\overline{K}_0^{*0}$ are assigned to the resonance $K_0^*(1430)$ (and not to the $K_0^*(800)$ state). The situation in the scalar-isoscalar sector is more complicated, due to the presence of a scalar glueball state G, see Ref. [14] and below. Then, σ_N, σ_S, G mix and generate the three resonances $f_0(1370)$, $f_0(1500)$, and $f_0(1710)$. There

is evidence [34] that $f_0(1370)$ is predominantly a $\sqrt{1/2}(\bar{u}u + \bar{d}d)$ state, while $f_0(1500)$ is predominantly a $\bar{s}s$ state and $f_0(1710)$ predominantly a glueball state. As a consequence, the light scalar states $f_0(500)$ and $f_0(980)$ are not quarkonia (but, arguably, tetraquark or molecular states) [35–38]. In the open charm sector, we assign the charmed states D_0^* to the resonances $D_0^*(2400)^0$ and $D_0^*(2400)^\pm$ (the latter state has not yet been unambiguously established). In the strange-charm sector we assign the state $D_{S0}^{*\pm}$ to the only existing candidate $D_{S0}^*(2317)^\pm$; it should, however, be stressed that the latter state has also been interpreted as a tetraquark or molecular state because it is too light when compared to quark-model predictions, see Refs. [19, 25–28, 39]. In the next section, we discuss in more detail the possibility that a heavier, very broad (and therefore not yet discovered) scalar charmed state exists. In the hidden charm sector the resonance χ_{c0} corresponds to the ground-state scalar charmonium $\chi_{c0}(1P)$.

The matrices P and S are used to construct the matrix $\Phi = S + iP$, which transforms under the group $U(4)_R \times U(4)_L$ as $\Phi \to U_L \Phi U_R^\dagger$, where U_L and U_R are independent 4×4 unitary matrices. Due to this property, the matrix Φ is used as a building block for the construction of a Lagrangian which is invariant under the chiral group $U(4)_R \times U(4)_L$, see below.

We now turn to the vector sector. The matrix V^μ which includes the vector degrees of freedom is:

$$V^\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\omega_N + \rho^0) & \rho^+ & K^*(892)^+ & D^{*0} \\ \rho^- & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\omega_N - \rho^0) & K^*(892)^0 & D^{*-} \\ K^*(892)^- & \bar{K}^*(892)^0 & \omega_S & D_S^{*-} \\ \overline{D}^{*0} & D^{*+} & D_S^{*+} & J/\psi \end{pmatrix}^\mu \quad . \tag{3}$$

The quark-antiquark content is that shown in Eq. (1), setting $\Gamma = \gamma^\mu$. The isotriplet field $\vec{\rho}$ corresponds to the ρ meson, the four kaonic states correspond to the resonance $K^*(892)$, the isoscalar states ω_N and ω_S correspond to the ω and ϕ mesons, respectively. [No mixing between strange and nonstrange isoscalars is present in the eLSM; this mixing is small anyway [40].] In the charm sector, the fields D^{*0}, $\overline{D}^{*0}$, D^{*+}, and D^{*-} correspond to the vector charmed resonances $D^*(2007)^0$ and $D^*(2010)^\pm$, respectively, while the strange-charmed $D_S^{*\pm}$ corresponds to the resonance $D_S^{*\pm}$ (with mass $M_{D_S^{*\pm}} = (2112.3 \pm 0.5)$ MeV; note, however, that the quantum numbers $J^P = 1^-$ are not yet fully established). Finally, J/ψ is the very well-known lowest vector charmonium state $J/\psi(1S)$.

The matrix A^μ describing the axial-vector degrees of freedom is given by:

$$A^\mu = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(f_{1,N} + a_1^0) & a_1^+ & K_1^+ & D_1^0 \\ a_1^- & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(f_{1,N} - a_1^0) & K_1^0 & D_1^- \\ K_1^- & \bar{K}_1^0 & f_{1,S} & D_{S1}^- \\ \bar{D}_1^0 & D_1^+ & D_{S1}^+ & \chi_{c1} \end{pmatrix}^\mu \quad . \tag{4}$$

The quark-antiquark content is that shown in Eq. (1), setting $\Gamma = \gamma^\mu\gamma^5$. The isotriplet field $\vec{a}_1$ corresponds to the field $a_1(1260)$, the four kaonic states K_1 correspond (predominantly) to the resonance $K_1(1200)$ [but also to $K_1(1400)$, because of mixing between axial-vector and pseudovector states, see Ref. [41] and refs. therein]. The isoscalar fields $f_{1,N}$ and $f_{1,S}$ correspond to $f_1(1285)$ and $f_1(1420)$, respectively. In the charm sector, the D_1 field is chosen to correspond to the resonances $D_1(2420)^0$ and $D_1(2420)^\pm$. (Another possibility would be the not yet very well established resonance $D_1(2430)^0$, or, due to mixing between axial- and pseudovector states, to a mixture of $D_1(2420)$ and $D_1(2430)$. Irrespective of this uncertainty, the small mass difference between these states would leave our results virtually unchanged.) The assignment of the strange-charmed doublet $D_{S1}^\pm$ is not yet settled, the two possibilities listed by the PDG are the resonances $D_{S1}(2460)^\pm$ and $D_{S1}(2536)^\pm$ [17]. According to various studies, the latter option is favored, while the former can be interpreted as a molecular or a tetraquark state [39, 42, 43]. Thus, we assign our quark-antiquark D_1 state to the resonance $D_{S1}(2536)^\pm$. Finally, the charm-anticharm state χ_{c1} can be unambiguously assigned to the charm-anticharm resonance $\chi_{c1}(1P)$.

From the matrices V^μ and A^μ we construct the left-handed and right-handed vector fields $L^\mu = V^\mu + A^\mu$ and $R^\mu = V^\mu - A^\mu$. Under chiral transformations they transform as $L^\mu \to U_L L^\mu U_L^\dagger$ and $R^\mu \to U_R L^\mu U_R^\dagger$. Due to this transformation property they are used as building blocks of the chirally invariant Lagrangian, see below.

The last field entering the model is the scalar glueball G, described by the dilaton Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}_{dil} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu G)^2 - \frac{1}{4}\frac{m_G^2}{\Lambda^2}\left(G^4 \log\frac{G}{\Lambda} - \frac{G^4}{4}\right) \ , \tag{5}$$

which mimics the trace anomaly of QCD [15, 16, 44]. The dimensionful parameter Λ sets the energy scale of low-energy QCD; in the chiral limit it is the only dimensionful parameter besides the coefficient of the term representing the axial anomaly. All other interaction terms of the Lagrangian are described by dimensionless coupling constants. The

parameter m_G is the glueball mass in the quenched approximation (no quarks), which is about 1.5-1.7 GeV [45]. As mentioned above, the identification of G is still uncertain, the two most likely candidates are $f_0(1500)$ and $f_0(1710)$ and/or admixtures of them. Note that, while we include the scalar glueball because it is conceptually important to guarantee dilatation invariance of the model (thus constraining the number of possible terms that it can have), just as in Ref. [15] we do not make an assignment for the glueball, since it does not affect the results of the present study. [The pseudoscalar glueball $\tilde{G}$ has been also added to the eLSM [46], but it is also not relevant here and therefore omitted.]

The full Lagrangian is constructed by requiring chiral symmetry, dilatation invariance (besides terms related to the current quark masses, the $U(1)_A$ anomaly, and the dilaton potential, which break this symmetry explicitly), and invariance under the discrete symmetries C and P:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \mathcal{L}_{dil} + \mathrm{Tr}[(D^\mu\Phi)^\dagger(D^\mu\Phi)] - m_0^2\left(\frac{G}{G_0}\right)^2 \mathrm{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger\Phi) - \lambda_1[\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)]^2 - \lambda_2\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)^2 + \mathrm{Tr}[H(\Phi+\Phi^\dagger)] \\ &+ \mathrm{Tr}\left\{\left[\left(\frac{G}{G_0}\right)^2\frac{m_1^2}{2} + \Delta\right]\left[(L^\mu)^2 + (R^\mu)^2\right]\right\} - \frac{1}{4}\mathrm{Tr}[(L^{\mu\nu})^2 + (R^{\mu\nu})^2] - 2\,\mathrm{Tr}[\varepsilon\Phi^\dagger\Phi] + c(\det\Phi - \det\Phi^\dagger)^2 \\ &+ i\frac{g_2}{2}\{\mathrm{Tr}(L_{\mu\nu}[L^\mu, L^\nu]) + \mathrm{Tr}(R_{\mu\nu}[R^\mu, R^\nu])\} + \frac{h_1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)\mathrm{Tr}[(L^\mu)^2 + (R^\mu)^2] + h_2\mathrm{Tr}[|\Phi R^\mu|^2 + |L^\mu\Phi|^2] \\ &+ 2h_3\mathrm{Tr}(\Phi R_\mu\Phi^\dagger L^\mu) + \dots\,, \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{dil}$ is the dilaton Lagrangian of Eq. (5), $D^\mu\Phi \equiv \partial^\mu\Phi - ig_1(L^\mu\Phi - \Phi R^\mu)$, $L^{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial^\mu L^\nu - \partial^\nu L^\mu$, and $R^{\mu\nu} \equiv \partial^\mu R^\nu - \partial^\nu R^\mu$. The dots refer to further chirally invariant terms listed in Ref. [15]; these terms do not affect the masses and decay widths studied in this work and are therefore omitted.

The terms involving the matrices H, ε, and Δ describe the breaking of dilatation and chiral symmetry due to nonzero current quark masses. They are of particular importance when the charmed mesons are considered, because the charm quark mass is large. We describe them separately:

(i) The term $\mathrm{Tr}[H(\Phi+\Phi^\dagger)]$ with

$$H = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} h_U & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & h_D & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2}h_S & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{2}h_C \end{pmatrix}, \tag{7}$$

describes the usual explicit symmetry breaking (tilting of the Mexican-hat potential). The constants h_i are proportional to the current quark masses, $h_i \propto m_i$. Here we work in the isospin-symmetric limit, $h_U = h_D = h_N$. The pion mass, for instance, turns out to be $m_\pi^2 \propto m_u$, in agreement with the Gell-Mann–Oakes–Renner (GOR) relation [47]. The parameter h_C is one of the three new parameters entering the $N_f = 4$ version of the model when compared to the $N_f = 3$ case of Ref. [15].

(ii) The term $-2\,\mathrm{Tr}[\varepsilon\Phi^\dagger\Phi]$ with

$$\varepsilon = \begin{pmatrix} \varepsilon_U & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \varepsilon_D & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_S & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \varepsilon_C \end{pmatrix}, \tag{8}$$

where $\varepsilon_i \propto m_i^2$ is the direct contribution of the bare quark masses to the (pseudo)scalar meson masses. In the isospin-symmetric limit $\varepsilon_U = \varepsilon_D = \varepsilon_N$ one can subtract from ε a matrix proportional to the identity in such a way that the parameter ε_N can be absorbed in the parameter m_0^2. Thus, without loss of generality we can set $\varepsilon_N = 0$. Following Ref. [15], for the sake of simplicity we shall here also set $\varepsilon_S = 0$, while we keep ε_C nonzero. This is the second additional parameter with respect to Ref. [15].

(iii) The term $\mathrm{Tr}\left[\Delta(L^{\mu 2} + R^{\mu 2})\right]$ with

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_U & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \delta_D & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \delta_S & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \delta_C \end{pmatrix}, \tag{9}$$

where $\delta_i \sim m_i^2$ describes the current quark-mass contribution to the masses of the (axial-)vector mesons. Also in this case, in the isospin-symmetric limit it is possible to set $\delta_U = \delta_D = \delta_N = 0$ because an identity matrix can be absorbed

in the term proportional to m_1^2. The parameter δ_S is taken from Ref. [15]. The third new parameter with respect to Ref. [15] is δ_C.

Note that in the present effective model the mass parameters δ_C and ε_C are not to be regarded as the second-order contribution in an expansion in powers of m_c. They simply represent the direct, and in this case dominant, contribution $\sim m_c$ of a charm quark to the masses of charmed (pseudo)scalar and (axial-)vector mesons.

Another important term in the Lagrangian (6) is $c(\det\Phi - \det\Phi^\dagger)^2$, which describes the axial anomaly and is responsible for the large η' mass. Care is needed, because the determinant changes when the number of flavors changes. The relation between c and its counterpart in the three-flavor case $c_{N_f=3}$ of Ref. [15] is given by:

$$c = \frac{2\, c_{N_f=3}}{\phi_C^2} \ . \tag{10}$$

Thus, the parameter c can be determined once the condensate ϕ_C is obtained, see next section.

The Lagrangian (6) induces spontaneous symmetry breaking if $m_0^2 < 0$: as a consequence, the scalar-isoscalar fields G, σ_N, σ_S, and χ_{c0} develop nonzero vacuum expectation values. One has to perform the shifts $G \to G + G_0$, $\sigma_N \to \sigma_N + \phi_N$, $\sigma_S \to \sigma_S + \phi_S$, and $\chi_{c0} \to \chi_{c0} + \phi_C$. The quantity G_0 is proportional to the gluon condensate [14], while ϕ_N, ϕ_S, and ϕ_C correspond to the nonstrange, strange, and charm quark-antiquark condensates.

Once the shifts are performed, one also has to get rid of mixing between (axial-)vector and (pseudo)scalar states by a proper shift of axial-vector fields and renormalization of the (pseudo)scalar ones. Then, the physical masses and interaction terms can be calculated. We present the detailed expressions for the masses in App. A.

We conclude this section with a few remarks on how to extend the Lagrangian (6) in order to improve the description of hadron vacuum properties. First of all, note that the requirement of dilatation invariance restricts the interaction terms in the Lagrangian to have naive scaling dimension four: higher-order dilatation-invariant terms would have to contain inverse powers of G, and thus would be non-analytic in this field. In this sense, our Lagrangian is complete and cannot be systematically improved by the inclusion of higher-order interaction terms, such as in theories with nonlinearly realized chiral symmetry. However, one may add further terms that violate dilatation invariance (which is already broken by the mass terms $\sim H, \varepsilon, \Delta$, and the $U(1)_A$–violating term $\sim c$) to improve the model.

Another possibility is to sacrifice chiral symmetry. For instance, since the explicit breaking of chiral symmetry by the charm quark mass is large (which is accounted for by the terms $\sim h_C, \varepsilon_C, \delta_C$), one could also consider chiral-symmetry violating interaction terms, e.g. replace

$$\lambda_2 \mathrm{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)^2 \longrightarrow \lambda_2 \mathrm{Tr}(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)^2 + \delta\lambda_2 \mathrm{Tr}(\mathbb{P}_C\Phi^\dagger\Phi)^2 \tag{11}$$

where $\mathbb{P}_C = \mathrm{diag}\{0,0,0,1\}$ is a projection operator onto the charmed states. A value $\delta\lambda_2 \neq 0$ explicitly breaks the symmetry of this interaction term from $U_R(4) \times U_L(4)$ to $U_R(3) \times U_L(3)$. One could modify the interaction terms proportional to λ_1, c, g_1, g_2, h_1, h_2, and h_3 in Eq. (6) in a similar manner.

III. RESULTS

A. Masses

The Lagrangian (6) contains the following 15 free parameters: m_0^2, λ_1, λ_2, m_1, g_1, c_1, h_1, h_2, h_3, δ_S, δ_C, ε_C, h_N, h_S, and h_C. For technical reasons, instead of the parameters h_N, h_S, and h_C entering Eq. (7), it is easier to use the condensates ϕ_N, ϕ_S, ϕ_C. This is obviously equivalent, because ϕ_N, ϕ_S, and ϕ_C form linearly independent combinations of the parameters.

In the large-N_c limit, one sets $h_1 = \lambda_1 = 0$. Then, as shown in Ref. [15] for the case $N_f = 3$, ten parameters can be determined by a fit to masses and decay widths of mesons below 1.5 GeV as shown in Tab. 1. In the following we use these values for our numerical calculations. As a consequence, the masses and the decay widths of the nonstrange-strange mesons are – by construction – identical to the results of Ref. [15] (see Tab. 2 and Fig. 1 in that reference). Note also that, in virtue of Eq. (10), the parameter combination $\phi_C^2 c/2$ is determined by the fit of Ref. [15].

Table 1: Values of the parameters [from Ref. [15]].

Parameter	Value	Parameter	Value
m_1^2	0.413×10^6 MeV^2	m_0^2	-0.918×10^6 MeV^2
$\phi_C^2 c/2$	450×10^{-6} MeV^{-2}	δ_S	0.151×10^6MeV^2
g_1	5.84	h_1	0
h_2	9.88	h_3	3.87
ϕ_N	164.6 MeV	ϕ_S	126.2 MeV
λ_1	0	λ_2	68.3

For the purposes of the present work, we are left with three unknown parameters: ϕ_C, ε_C, δ_C. We determine them by performing a fit to twelve experimental (hidden and open) charmed meson masses listed by the PDG [17]

$$\chi^2 \equiv \sum_i^{12} \left(\frac{M_i^{th} - M_i^{exp}}{\xi M_i^{exp}} \right)^2 , \tag{12}$$

where ξ is a constant. We do not use the experimental errors for the masses, because we do not expect to reach the same precision with our effective model which, besides other effects, already neglects isospin breaking. In Ref. [15], we required a minimum error of 5% for experimental quantities entering our fit, and obtained a reduced χ^2 of about 1.23. Here, we slightly change our fit strategy: we choose the parameter ξ such that the reduced χ^2 takes the value $\chi^2/(12-3) = 1$, which yields $\xi = 0.07$. This implies that we enlarge the experimental errors to 7% of the respective masses.

The parameters (together with their theoretical errors) are:

$$\phi_C = (176 \pm 28) \text{ MeV}, \;\; \delta_C = (3.91 \pm 0.36) \times 10^6 \text{ MeV}^2, \;\; \varepsilon_C = (2.23 \pm 0.71) \times 10^6 \text{ MeV}^2 \; . \tag{13}$$

In Tab. 2 we present the results of our fit by comparing the theoretically computed with the experimentally measured masses [see also Ref. [48] for preliminary results]. For the nonstrange-charmed states we use the masses of the neutral members of the multiplet in the fit, because the corresponding resonances have been clearly identified and the masses have been well determined for all quantum numbers. In view of the fact that the employed model is built as a low-energy chiral model and that only three parameters enter the fit, the masses are quite well described. The mismatch grows for increasing masses because Eq. (12) imposes, by construction, a better precision for low masses. For comparison, in the right column of Tab. 2 we also show the value $0.07 M_i^{exp}$ which represents the 'artificial experimental error' that we have used in our fit.

Table 2: Masses of charmed meson used in the fit.

Resonance	Quark content	J^P	Our Value [MeV]	Experimental Value [MeV]	7% of the exp. value [MeV]
D^0	$u\bar{c}, \bar{u}c$	0^-	1981 ± 73	1864.86 ± 0.13	130
$D_S^{\pm}$	$s\bar{c}, \bar{s}c$	0^-	2004 ± 74	1968.50 ± 0.32	138
$\eta_c(1S)$	$c\bar{c}$	0^-	2673 ± 118	2983.7 ± 0.7	209
$D_0^*(2400)^0$	$u\bar{c}, \bar{u}c$	0^+	2414 ± 77	2318 ± 29	162
$D_{S0}^*(2317)^{\pm}$	$s\bar{c}, \bar{s}c$	0^+	2467 ± 76	2317.8 ± 0.6	162
$\chi_{c0}(1P)$	$c\bar{c}$	0^+	3144 ± 128	3414.75 ± 0.31	239
$D^*(2007)^0$	$u\bar{c}, \bar{u}c$	1^-	2168 ± 70	2006.99 ± 0.15	140
D_S^*	$s\bar{c}, \bar{s}c$	1^-	2203 ± 69	2112.3 ± 0.5	148
$J/\psi(1S)$	$c\bar{c}$	1^-	2947 ± 109	3096.916 ± 0.011	217
$D_1(2420)^0$	$u\bar{c}, \bar{u}c$	1^+	2429 ± 63	2421.4 ± 0.6	169
$D_{S1}(2536)^{\pm}$	$s\bar{c}, \bar{s}c$	1^+	2480 ± 63	2535.12 ± 0.13	177
$\chi_{c1}(1P)$	$c\bar{c}$	1^+	3239 ± 101	3510.66 ± 0.07	246

The following remarks about our results are in order.

(i) Remembering that our model is a low-energy effective approach to the strong interaction, it is quite surprising that the masses of the open charmed states are in good quantitative agreement (within the theoretical error) with experimental data. In particular, when taking into account the 7% range (right column of Tab. 2), almost all the results are within 1σ or only slightly above it. Clearly, our results cannot compete with the precision of other approaches, but show that a connection to low-energy models is possible.

(ii) With the exception of J/ψ, the masses of the charmonia states are underestimated by about 10% as is particularly visible for the resonance $\eta_c(1S)$. On the one hand, this is due to the way the fit has been performed; on the other hand, it points to the fact that unique values of the parameters h_C, δ_C, and ε_C are not sufficient for a precise description of both open and hidden charmed states over the whole energy range. One way to improve the fit of the charmonium masses would be to include non-zero values for λ_1, h_1. Another way is explicitly breaking the chiral symmetry as discussed at the end of Sec. II. However, since the description of open charm states is already reasonable, we only need to consider the charmonium states. For the (pseudo)scalar charmonia, we would thus modify the second term in Eq. (11) by introducing another projection operator under the trace, $\text{Tr}(\mathbb{P}_C \Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 \to \text{Tr}(\mathbb{P}_C \Phi^\dagger \mathbb{P}_C \Phi)^2$. A similar consideration could be done for the (axial-)vector charmonia.

(iii) The experimental value for the mass of the charged scalar state $D_0^*(2400)^{\pm}$, which is $(2403 \pm 14 \pm 35)$ MeV, is in fair agreement with our theoretical result, although the existence of this resonance has not yet been unambiguously established.

(iv) The theoretically computed mass of the strange-charmed scalar state $D_{S0}^{*\pm}$ turns out to be larger than that of the charmed state $D_0^*(2400)^0$. This is a natural consequence of the strange quark being heavier than up and down quark. Note that, however, the experimentally measured masses of $D_{S0}^*(2317)^\pm$ and $D_0^*(2400)^0$ are virtually identical, which is somewhat surprising.

(v) The theoretical mass of the axial-vector strange-charmed state D_{S1} reads 2480 MeV, which lies in between the two physical states $D_{S1}(2460)^\pm$ and $D_{S1}(2536)^\pm$. We shall re-analyze the scalar and the axial-vector strange-charmed states in light of the results for the decay widths, see next subsection.

As a next step, we turn our attention to some mass differences and to the role of the charm condensate ϕ_C. Namely, in the following mass differences the parameters ε_C and δ_C cancels:

$$m_{D_1}^2 - m_{D^*}^2 = \sqrt{2}\,(g_1^2 - h_3)\phi_N\,\phi_C, \quad m_{\chi_{c1}}^2 - m_{J/\psi}^2 = 2\,(g_1^2 - h_3)\phi_C^2,\; m_{D_{S1}}^2 - m_{D_S^*}^2 = 2\,(g_1^2 - h_3)\phi_S\,\phi_C\,. \tag{14}$$

Using Eq. (13), the theoretical results are

$$m_{D_1}^2 - m_{D^*}^2 = (1.2\pm0.6)\times10^6\ \mathrm{MeV}^2\ ,\quad m_{\chi_{c1}}^2 - m_{J/\psi}^2 = (1.8\pm1.3)\times10^6\ \mathrm{MeV}^2,\quad m_{D_{S1}}^2 - m_{D_S^*}^2 = (1.2\pm0.6)\times10^6\ \mathrm{MeV}^2\,,$$

while the experimental values are (the experimental errors are omitted because, being of the order of 10^3 MeV^2, they are very small when compared to the theoretical ones):

$$m_{D_1}^2 - m_{D^*}^2 = 1.82\times10^6\ \mathrm{MeV}^2\ ,\quad m_{\chi_{c1}}^2 - m_{J/\psi}^2 = 2.73\times10^6\ \mathrm{MeV}^2\ ,\quad m_{D_{S1}}^2 - m_{D_S^*}^2 = 1.97\times10^6\ \mathrm{MeV}^2\,.$$

The agreement is fairly good, which shows that our determination of the charm condensate ϕ_C is compatible with the experiment, although it still has a large uncertainty. Note that a similar determination of ϕ_C via the weak decay constants of charmed mesons determined via the PCAC relations has been presented in Ref. [49]. Their result is $\phi_C/\phi_N \simeq 1.35$, which is compatible to our ratio of about 1.07 ± 0.20. Previously, Ref. [50] determined $\phi_C/\phi_N \simeq 1.08$ in the framework of the NJL model, which is in perfect agreement with our result.

From a theoretical point of view, it is instructive to study the behavior of the condensate ϕ_C as function of the heavy quark mass m_c. To this end, we recall that the equation determining ϕ_C is of the third-order type and reads (for $\lambda_1 = 0$)

$$h_{0,C} = (m_0^2 + 2\varepsilon_C)\phi_C + \lambda_2\phi_C^3\ . \tag{15}$$

By imposing the scaling behaviors $h_{0,C} = m_c\tilde{h}_{0,C}$ and $\varepsilon_C = m_c^2\tilde{\varepsilon}_C$, the solution for large values of m_c reads $\phi_C \simeq h_{0,C}/2\varepsilon_C \propto 1/m_c$, which shows that the mass differences of Eq. (14) vanish in the heavy-quark limit. However, the fact that the value of the charm condensate turns out to be quite large implies that the charm quark is not yet that close to the heavy-quark limit. To show this aspect, we plot in Fig. 1 the condensate ϕ_C as function of m_c by keeping all other parameters fixed. Obviously, this is a simplifying assumption, but the main point of this study is a qualitative demonstration that the chiral condensate of charm-anticharm quarks is non-negligible.

Note that, in contrast to the demands of heavy-quark spin symmetry [18], our chiral approach does not necessarily imply an equal mass of the vector and pseudoscalar states and of scalar and axial-vector states. Namely, for a very large heavy quark mass one has $m_D^2 \simeq \varepsilon_C$ and $m_{D^*}^2 \simeq \delta_C$. Thus, in order to obtain a degeneracy of these mesons, as predicted by heavy-quark symmetry, we should additionally impose that $\varepsilon_C = \delta_C$. Numerically, the values have indeed the same order of magnitude, but differ by a factor of two, see Eq. (13). Nevertheless, the difference of masses $m_{D^*} - m_D \simeq 180$ MeV of the spin-0 and spin-1 negative-parity open charm states turns out to be (at least within theoretical errors) in quantitative agreement with the experiment. Thus, at least for negative-parity mesons, our chiral approach seems to correctly predict the amount of breaking of the heavy-quark spin symmetry. For the mass difference $m_{D_1} - m_{D_0^*}$ of spin-0 and spin-1 mesons with positive parity, our model underpredicts the experimental values by an order of magnitude, i.e., our approach based on chiral symmetry follows the predictions of heavy-quark symmetry even more closely than nature!

We conclude our discussion of the charmed meson masses by remarking that chiral symmetry (and its breaking) may still have a sizable influence in the charm sector. In this context it is interesting to note that in the works [22, 23] the degeneracy of vector and axial-vector charmed states in the heavy-quark limit [see Eq. (14)] as well as of scalar and pseudoscalar charmed states was obtained by combining the heavy-quark spin and the (linear) chiral symmetries.

EndExpansion

B. Decays

In this subsection we study the decays of charmed mesons. As a first step we evaluate the weak-decay constants of the pseudoscalar mesons D and D_S. Their analytic expressions read [see App. A and also Ref. [48]]

$$f_D = \frac{\phi_N + \sqrt{2}\phi_C}{\sqrt{2} Z_D} \ , \ f_{D_S} = \frac{\phi_S + \phi_C}{Z_{D_S}} \ , \ f_{\eta_c} = \frac{2\phi_C}{Z_{\eta_C}} \ . \tag{16}$$

Using the parameters of the fit we obtain

$$f_D = (254 \pm 17) \text{ MeV} \ , \ f_{D_S} = (261 \pm 17) \text{ MeV} \ , \ f_{\eta_C} = (314 \pm 39) \text{ MeV}. \tag{17}$$

The experimental values $f_D = (206.7 \pm 8.9)$ MeV and $f_{D_S} = (260.5 \pm 5.4)$ MeV [17] show a good agreement for f_{D_S} and a slightly too large theoretical result for f_D. The quantity f_{η_C} is in fair agreement with the experimental value $f_{\eta_C} = (335 \pm 75)$ MeV [52] as well as with the theoretical result $f_{\eta_C} = (300 \pm 50)$ MeV obtained in Ref. [53]. These results show that our determination of the condensate ϕ_C is reliable (even if the theoretical uncertainty is still large).

We now turn to the (OZI-dominant) strong decay widths of the resonances D_0, D^*, D_1, and D_{S1}. The results are summarized in Tab. 3. For the calculation of the decay widths we have used the physical masses listed by the PDG. This is necessary in order to have the correct phase space. Although the theoretical uncertainties are large and some experimental results are not yet well known, the qualitative agreement is remarkable if one considers that the decay amplitudes depend on the parameters of the three-flavor version of the model determined in Ref. [15]. Note that the theoretical errors have been calculated by taking into account the uncertainty in the charm condensate $\phi_C = (176 \pm 28)$ MeV. The lower theoretical value corresponds to $\phi_C = (176 - 28)$ MeV, while the upper one to $\phi_C = (176 + 28)$ MeV. The explicit expressions for the decay widths are reported in App. B.

Here we do not study the decay of other (hidden and open) charmed states because we restrict ourselves to OZI-dominant processes. The study of OZI-suppressed decays which involve the large-N_c suppressed parameters λ_1 and h_1 is left for future work. Then, also the decays of the well-known charmonium states (such as χ_{c0} and η_c) will be investigated.

Table 3: Decay widths of charmed mesons



FIG. 1: Condensate ϕ_C as function of the quark mass m_c. The dot corresponds to the physical value $m_c = 1.275$ GeV [17].

Decay Channel	Theoretical result [MeV]	Experimental result [MeV]
$D_0^*(2400)^0 \to D\pi = D^+\pi^- + D^0\pi^0$	139^{+243}_{-114}	$D^+\pi^-$ seen; full width $\Gamma = 267 \pm 40$
$D_0^*(2400)^+ \to D\pi = D^+\pi^0 + D^0\pi^+$	51^{+182}_{-51}	$D^+\pi^0$ seen; full width: $\Gamma = 283 \pm 24 \pm 34$
$D^*(2007)^0 \to D^0\pi^0$	0.025 ± 0.003	seen; < 1.3
$D^*(2007)^0 \to D^+\pi^-$	0	not seen
$D^*(2010)^+ \to D^+\pi^0$	$0.018^{+0.002}_{-0.003}$	0.029 ± 0.008
$D^*(2010)^+ \to D^0\pi^+$	$0.038^{+0.005}_{-0.004}$	0.065 ± 0.017
$D_1(2420)^0 \to D^*\pi = D^{*+}\pi^- + D^{*0}\pi^0$	65^{+51}_{-37}	$D^{*+}\pi^-$ seen; full width: $\Gamma = 27.4 \pm 2.5$
$D_1(2420)^0 \to D^0\pi\pi = D^0\pi^+\pi^- + D^0\pi^0\pi^0$	0.59 ± 0.02	seen
$D_1(2420)^0 \to D^+\pi^-\pi^0$	$0.21^{+0.01}_{-0.015}$	seen
$D_1(2420)^0 \to D^+\pi^-$	0	not seen; $\Gamma(D^+\pi^-)/\Gamma(D^{*+}\pi^-) < 0.24$
$D_1(2420)^+ \to D^*\pi = D^{*+}\pi^0 + D^{*0}\pi^+$	65^{+51}_{-36}	$D^{*0}\pi^+$ seen; full width: $\Gamma = 25 \pm 6$
$D_1(2420)^+ \to D^+\pi\pi = D^+\pi^+\pi^- + D^+\pi^0\pi^0$	0.56 ± 0.02	seen
$D_1(2420)^+ \to D^0\pi^0\pi^+$	0.22 ± 0.01	seen
$D_1(2420)^+ \to D^0\pi^+$	0	not seen; $\Gamma(D^0\pi^+)/\Gamma(D^{*0}\pi^+) < 0.18$
$D_{S1}(2536)^+ \to D^*K = D^{*0}K^+ + D^{*+}K^0$	25^{+22}_{-15}	seen; full width $\Gamma = 0.92 \pm 0.03 \pm 0.04$
$D_{S1}(2536)^+ \to D^+K^0$	0	not seen
$D_{S1}(2536)^+ \to +D^0K^+$	0	not seen

The following comments are in order:

(i) The decay of $D_0^*(2400)^0$ into $D\pi$ has a very large theoretical error due to the imprecise determination of ϕ_C. A qualitative statement is, however, possible: the decay channel $D_0^*(2400)^0 \to D\pi$ is large and is the only OZI-dominant decay predicted by our model. This decay channel is also the only one seen in experiment (although the branching ratio is not yet known). A similar discussion holds for the charged counterpart $D_0^*(2400)^+$.

(ii) The decay widths of the vector charmed states $D^*(2007)^0$ and $D^*(2010)^+$ are slightly smaller than the experimental results, but close to the lower bounds of the latter.

(iii) The results for the axial-vector charmed states $D_1(2420)^0$ and $D_1(2420)^+$ are compatible with experiment. Note that the decay into $D^*\pi$ is the only one which is experimentally seen. Moreover, the decays $D_1(2420)^0 \to D^+\pi^-$ and $D_1(2420)^+ \to D^0\pi^+$, although kinematically allowed, do not occur in our model because there is no respective tree-level coupling; this is in agreement with the small experimental upper bound. Improvements in the decay channels of $D_1(2420)$ are possible by taking into account also the multiplet of pseudovector quark-antiquark states. In this way, one will be able to evaluate the mixing of these configurations and describe at the same time the resonances $D_1(2420)$ and $D_1(2430)$.

(iv) In the low-energy language, the vector states $D^*(2007)^0$ and $D^*(2010)^\pm$ and the axial-vector states $D_1(2420)^0$ and $D_1(2420)^+$ are chiral partners. The fact that our model is at least in qualitative agreement with the experimental data for their decay widths indicates that chiral symmetry is still important in the energy range relevant for charmed mesons.

(v) The decay of the axial-vector strange-charmed $D_{S1}(2536)^+ \to D^*K$ is too large in our model when compared to the experimental data of about 1 MeV. This result is robust upon variation of the parameters, as the error shows. We thus conclude that the resonance $D_{S1}(2536)^\pm$ is not favored to be (predominantly) a member of the axial-vector multiplet (it can be, however, a member of the pseudovector multiplet). Then, we discuss two possible solutions to the problem of identifying the axial-vector strange-charmed quarkonium:

Solution 1: There is a 'seed' quark-antiquark axial-vector state D_{S1} above the D^*K threshold, which is, however, very broad and for this reason has *not yet* been detected. Quantum corrections generate the state $D_{S1}(2460)^\pm$ through pole doubling [54]. In this scenario, $D_{S1}(2460)$ is dynamically generated but is still related to a broad quark-antiquark seed state. In this way, the low mass of $D_{S1}(2460)$ in comparison to the quark-model prediction [19] is due to quantum corrections [24, 51, 55]. Then, the state $D_{S1}(2460)$, being below threshold, has a very small decay width.

Solution 2: Also in this case, there is still a broad and not yet detected quark-antiquark field above threshold, but solution 1 is assumed not to apply (loops are not sufficient to generate $D_{S1}(2460)$). The resonance $D_{S1}(2460)^\pm$ is not a quark-antiquark field, but a tetraquark or a loosely bound molecular state and its existence is not related to the quark-antiquark state of the axial-vector multiplet.

(vi) For the state $D_{S0}^*(2317)$ similar arguments apply. If the mass of this state is above the DK threshold, we predict a very large ($\gtrsim 1$ GeV) decay width into DK (for example: $\Gamma_{D_{S0}^* \to DK} \simeq 3$ GeV for a D_{S0}^* mass of 2467 MeV as determined in Tab. 2). Then, the two solutions mentioned above are applicable also here:

Solution 1: A quark-antiquark state with a mass above the DK threshold exists, but it is too broad to be seen in experiment. The state $D_{S0}(2317)$ arises through the pole-doubling mechanism.

Solution 2: Loops are not sufficient to dynamically generate $D_{S0}^*(2317)$. The latter is not a quarkonium but either a tetraquark or a molecular state.

In conclusion, a detailed study of loops in the axial-vector and scalar strange-charm sector needs to be performed. In the axial-vector strange-charm sector mixing with a pseudovector quark-antiquark state should also be included. These tasks go beyond the tree-level analysis of our work but are an interesting subject for the future.

IV. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

In this work we have developed a four-flavor extended linear sigma model with vector and axial-vector degrees of freedom. Within this model, we have calculated masses and decay widths of charmed mesons.

For the coupling constants of the model, we have used the values determined in the low-energy study of Ref. [15] and listed in Tab. 1. The three remaining parameters related to the current charm quark mass were determined in a fit to twelve masses of hidden and open charmed mesons. The results are shown in Tab. 2: the open charmed mesons agree within theoretical errors with the experimental values, while the masses of charmonia are (with the exception of J/ψ) underestimated by about 10%. The precision of our approach cannot compete with methods based on heavy-quark symmetry, but it admits a perspective on charmed states from a low-energy approach based on chiral symmetry and dilatation invariance. The level of agreement with experimental data proves that these symmetries are, at least to some degree, still relevant for the charm sector. In this respect, our approach is a useful tool to investigate the assignment of some charmed states (see below) and to obtain an independent determination of quantities such as the chiral condensate of charm-anticharm quarks. The latter turns out to be sizable, showing that the charm quark, although heavy, is indeed still connected to nontrivial vacuum dynamics.

We have also calculated the weak-decay constants of the pseudoscalar states D, D_S, and η_c, which are in fair agreement with the experimental values and, as a last step, we have evaluated the OZI-dominant decays of charmed mesons (Tab. 3). The result for $D_0^*(2400)^0$, $D_0^*(2400)^+$, $D^*(2007)^0$, $D^*(2010)^+$, $D_1(2420)^0$, and $D_1(2420)^+$ are compatible with the results listed by the PDG [17], although the theoretical errors are still quite large and some experimental values are only upper bounds.

In summary, the fact that an (although at this stage only rough) qualitative description is obtained by using a chiral model and, more remarkably, employing values for the coupling constants, which were determined in a study of $N_f = 3$ mesons, means that a remnant of chiral symmetry is present also in the sector of charmed mesons. Chiral symmetry is still of some relevance because the parameters of the eLSM do not vary too much as a function of the energy at which they are probed. Besides mass terms which describe the large contribution of the current charm quark mass, all interaction terms are the same as in the low-energy effective model of Refs. [12, 14, 15] which was built under the requirements of chiral symmetry and dilatation invariance. As a by-product of our work we also evaluate the charm condensate which is of the same order as the nonstrange and strange quark condensates. This is also in accord with chiral dynamics enlarged to the group $U(4)_R \times U(4)_L$.

Concerning the assignment of the scalar and axial-vector strange-charmed quarkonium states D_{S0} and D_{S1}, we obtain the following: If the masses of these quarkonia are above the respective thresholds, we find that their decay widths are too large, which probably means that these states, even if they exist, have escaped detection. In this case, the resonances $D_{S0}^*(2317)$ and $D_{S1}(2460)$ can emerge as dynamically generated companion poles (alternatively, they can be tetraquark or molecular states). Our results imply also that the interpretation of the resonance $D_{S1}(2536)$ as a member of the axial-vector multiplet is not favored because the experimental width is too narrow when compared to the theoretical width of a quarkonium state with the same mass. An investigation of these resonances necessitates the calculation of quantum fluctuations and represents a topic of future work.

A further important future project is the study of OZI-suppressed decays of charmonium states. To this end, one should allow for a nonzero value of the large-N_c suppressed parameters. Due to the large amount of existing data, this is an interesting project to test our chiral approach in more detail in the realm of hidden and open charmed states.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank F.-K. Guo for pointing us to Ref. [39], and C. Sasaki and J. Schaffner-Bielich for making us aware of Refs. [49, 50]. We also acknowledge useful discussions with D. Parganlija, S. Schramm, and M. Wagner about the extension of the eLSM to four flavors, and discussions with P. Kovacs and Gy. Wolf about the fit in the three-flavor case. W.I.E. acknowledges financial support from DAAD and HGS-HIRe.

Appendix A: Shifts and masses

1. Shifts

Due to spontaneous symmetry breaking the scalar-isoscalar fields σ_N, σ_S, and χ_{c0} are shifted by their vacuum expectation values ϕ_N, ϕ_S, and ϕ_C as:

$$\sigma_N \to \sigma_N + \phi_N \ , \ \sigma_S \to \sigma_S + \phi_S, \ \chi_{c0} \to \chi_{c0} + \phi_C \, . \tag{A1}$$

As a consequence, bilinear mixing terms involving the mesons η_N-f_{1N}, $\overrightarrow{\pi}$-$\overrightarrow{a}_1$, η_S-f_{1S}, K_0^*-K^*, and K-K_1 arise [12, 14, 15, 30, 56]:

$$\begin{aligned}
&- g_1\phi_N(f_{1N}^\mu\partial_\mu\eta_N + \overrightarrow{a}_1^{\,\mu}\cdot\partial_\mu\overrightarrow{\pi}) - \sqrt{2}\, g_1\phi_S f_{1S}^\mu\partial_\mu\eta_S \\
&- i\frac{g_1}{2}(\phi_N - \phi_S)(\overline{K}^{*\mu 0}\,\partial_\mu K_0^{*0} + K^{*\mu -}\,\partial_\mu K_0^{*+}) \\
&+ i\frac{g_1}{2}(\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_s)(K^{*\mu 0}\,\partial_\mu\overline{K}_0^{*0} + K^{*\mu +}\,\partial_\mu K_0^{*-}) \\
&- \frac{g_1}{2}(\phi_N + \sqrt{2}\,\phi_S)(K_1^{\mu 0}\,\partial_\mu\overline{K}^0 + K_1^{\mu +}\,\partial_\mu K^- + \overline{K}_1^{\mu 0}\,\partial_\mu K^0 + K_1^{\mu -}\,\partial_\mu K^+) \, .
\end{aligned} \tag{A2}$$

In addition, for charmed mesons similar mixing terms of the type η_C-χ_{c1}, D_S-D_{S1}, D_{S0}^*-D_{S1}^*, D_0^*-D^*, and D-D_1 are present:

$$\begin{aligned}
&- g_1\phi_C\,\chi_{c1}^\mu\,\partial_\mu\eta_C - \frac{g_1}{\sqrt{2}}\,g_1\phi_S(D_{S1}^{\mu -}\,\partial_\mu D_S^+ + D_{S1}^{\mu +}\,\partial_\mu D_S^-) \\
&+ i\frac{g_1}{\sqrt{2}}\,\phi_S(D_S^{*\mu -}\,\partial_\mu D_{S0}^{*+} - D_S^{*\mu +}\,\partial_\mu D_{S0}^{*-}) \\
&+ \, i\frac{g_1}{2}\,\phi_N(D^{*\mu -}\,\partial_\mu D_0^{*+} - D^{*\mu +}\,\partial_\mu D_0^{*-} + D^{*\mu 0}\,\partial_\mu\overline{D}_{\,0}^{\,*0} - \overline{D}^{\,*\mu 0}\,\partial_\mu D_0^{*0}) \\
&- \frac{g_1}{2}\,\phi_N(D_1^{0\mu}\,\partial_\mu\overline{D}^0 + \overline{D}_{\,1}^{\,\mu 0}\,\partial_\mu D^0 + D_1^{\mu +}\,\partial_\mu D^- + D_1^{\mu -}\,\partial_\mu D^+) \, .
\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

These mixing terms are removed by performing the following field transformations:

$$f_{1N,S}^\mu \to f_{1N,S}^\mu + w_{f_{1N,S}}\, Z_{\eta_{N,S}}\,\partial^\mu\eta_{N,S}\,, \tag{A4}$$
$$\overrightarrow{a}_1^{\,\mu} \to \overrightarrow{a}_1^{\,\mu} + w_{a_1}\, Z_\pi\,\partial^\mu\overrightarrow{\pi}\,, \tag{A5}$$
$$K^{*\mu +,0} \to K^{*\mu +,0} + w_{K^*}\, Z_{K_0^*}\,\partial^\mu K_0^{*+,0}\,, \tag{A6}$$
$$K^{*\mu -,\bar{0}} \to K^{*\mu -,\bar{0}} + w_{K^*}^*\, Z_{K_0^*}\,\partial^\mu K_0^{*-,\bar{0}}\,, \tag{A7}$$
$$K_1^{\mu \pm,0,\bar{0}} \to K_1^{\mu \pm,0,\bar{0}} + w_{K_1}\, Z_K\,\partial^\mu K^{\pm,0,\bar{0}}\,, \tag{A8}$$
$$\chi_{c1}^\mu \to \chi_{c1}^\mu + w_{\chi_{c1}}\, Z_{\eta_C}\,\partial^\mu\eta_C\,, \tag{A9}$$
$$D_{S1}^{\mu \pm} \to D_{S1}^{\mu \pm} + w_{D_{S1}}\, Z_{D_S}\,\partial^\mu D_S^\pm\,, \tag{A10}$$
$$D_S^{*\mu -} \to D_S^{*\mu -} + w_{D_S^*}\, Z_{D_{S0}^*}\,\partial^\mu D_{S0}^{*-}\,, \tag{A11}$$
$$D_S^{*\mu +} \to D_S^{*\mu +} + w_{D_S^*}^*\, Z_{D_{S0}^*}\,\partial^\mu D_{S0}^{*+}\,, \tag{A12}$$
$$D^{*\mu +} \to D^{*\mu +} + w_{D^*}^*\, Z_{D_0^*}\,\partial^\mu D_0^{*+}\,, \tag{A13}$$
$$D^{*\mu -} \to D^{*\mu -} + w_{D^*}\, Z_{D_0^*}\,\partial^\mu D_0^{*-}\,, \tag{A14}$$
$$\overline{D}^{\,*\mu 0} \to \overline{D}^{\,*\mu 0} + w_{D^{*0}}^*\, Z_{D_0^{*0}}\,\partial^\mu\overline{D}_{\,0}^{\,*0}\,, \tag{A15}$$
$$D^{*\mu 0} \to D^{*\mu 0} + w_{D^{*0}}\, Z_{D_0^{*0}}\,\partial^\mu D_0^{*0}\,, \tag{A16}$$
$$D_1^{\mu \pm,0,\bar{0}} \to D_1^{\mu \pm,0,\bar{0}} + w_{D_1}\, Z_D\,\partial^\mu D^{\pm,0,\bar{0}}\,, \tag{A17}$$

The constants appearing in the previous expressions are:

$$w_{f_{1N}} = w_{a_1} = \frac{g_1\phi_N}{m_{a_1}^2}, \qquad w_{f_{1S}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}g_1\phi_S}{m_{f_{1S}}^2}\,, \tag{A18}$$

$$w_{K^*} = \frac{ig_1(\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_S)}{2\,m_{K^*}^2}, \qquad w_{K_1} = \frac{g_1(\phi_N + \sqrt{2}\phi_S}{2\,m_{K_1}^2}\,, \tag{A19}$$

$$w_{\chi_{c1}} = \frac{\sqrt{2}g_1\phi_C}{m_{\chi_{c1}}^2}, \qquad w_{D_{S1}} = \frac{g_1(\phi_S + \phi_C)}{\sqrt{2}m_{D_{S1}}^2}\,, \tag{A20}$$

$$w_{D_S^*} = \frac{ig_1(\phi_S - \phi_C)}{\sqrt{2}m_{D_S^*}^2}, \qquad w_{D^*} = \frac{ig_1(\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_C)}{2\,m_{D^*}^2}\,, \tag{A21}$$

$$w_{D^{*0}} = \frac{ig_1(\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_C)}{2\,m_{D^{*0}}^2}, \qquad w_{D_1} = \frac{g_1(\phi_N + \sqrt{2}\phi_C)}{2\,m_{D_1}^2}\,. \tag{A22}$$

Moreover, one has to rescale the (pseudo)scalar fields as:

$$\begin{aligned} &\pi^{\pm,0} \to Z_\pi \pi^{\pm,0}, && K^{\pm,0,\bar{0}} \to Z_K K^{\pm,0,\bar{0}}\,, \\ &\eta_{N/S/C} \to Z_{\eta_N/\eta_S/\eta_C}\eta_{N/S/C}, && K_0^{\star\pm,0,\bar{0}} \to Z_{K^\star} K_0^{\star\pm,0,\bar{0}}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{A23}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &D^{\pm,0,\bar{0}} \to Z_D D^{\pm,0,\bar{0}}, && D_0^{*\pm} \to Z_{D_0^*} D_0^{*\pm}\,, \\ &D_0^{*0,\bar{0}} \to Z_{D_0^{*0}} D_0^{*0,\bar{0}}, && D_{S0}^{*\pm} \to Z_{D_{S0}^*} D_{S0}^{*\pm}\,, \end{aligned} \tag{A24}$$

where the wave-function renormalization constants read:

$$Z_\pi \equiv Z_{\eta_N} = \frac{m_{a_1}}{\sqrt{m_{a_1}^2 - g_1^2\,\phi_N^2}}, \qquad Z_{\eta_S} = \frac{m_{f_{1S}}}{\sqrt{m_{f_{1S}}^2 - 2\,g_1^2\,\phi_S^2}}\,, \tag{A25}$$

$$Z_K = \frac{2m_{K_1}}{\sqrt{4m_{K_1}^2 - g_1^2(\phi_N + \sqrt{2}\phi_S)^2}}, \qquad Z_{K_S} = \frac{2m_{K_*}}{\sqrt{4m_{K_*}^2 - g_1^2(\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_S)^2}}\,, \tag{A26}$$

$$Z_{\eta_C} = \frac{m_{\chi_{c1}}}{\sqrt{m_{\chi_{c1}}^2 - 2g_1^2\phi_C^2}}\,, \qquad Z_{D_S} = \frac{\sqrt{2}m_{D_{S1}}}{\sqrt{2m_{D_{S1}}^2 - g_1^2(\phi_S + \phi_C)^2}}\,, \tag{A27}$$

$$Z_{D_{S0}^*} = \frac{\sqrt{2}m_{D_S^*}}{\sqrt{2m_{D_S^*}^2 - g_1^2(\phi_S - \phi_C)^2}}\,, \qquad Z_{D_0^*} = \frac{2\,m_{D^*}}{\sqrt{4m_{D^*}^2 - g_1^2(\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_C)^2}}\,, \tag{A28}$$

$$Z_{D_0^{*0}} = \frac{2\,m_{D^{*0}}}{\sqrt{4m_{D^{*0}}^2 - g_1^2(\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_C)^2}}\,, \qquad Z_D = \frac{2\,m_{D_1}}{\sqrt{4m_{D_1}^2 - g_1^2(\phi_N + \sqrt{2}\phi_C)^2}}\,. \tag{A29}$$

The nonstrange, strange, and charm condensates read:

$$\phi_N = Z_\pi f_\pi\,, \tag{A30}$$

$$\phi_S = \frac{2\,Z_K f_K - \phi_N}{\sqrt{2}}\,, \tag{A31}$$

$$\phi_C = \frac{2Z_D f_D - \phi_N}{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}Z_{D_S} f_{D_S} - \phi_S = \frac{Z_{\eta_C} f_{\eta_C}}{\sqrt{2}}, \tag{A32}$$

The quantities $f_\pi = 92.4$ MeV and $f_K = 155/\sqrt{2}$ MeV are the pion and kaon decay constants, while f_D and f_{D_S} are the decay constants of the pseudoscalar D and D_S mesons, respectively.

2. Tree-level masses

After having performed the transformation above, we obtain the tree-level masses of nonstrange-strange mesons in the eLSM:

(i) Pseudoscalar mesons:

$$m_\pi^2 = Z_\pi^2\left[m_0^2 + \left(\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right)\phi_N^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_S^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_C^2\right], \tag{A33}$$

$$m_K^2 = Z_K^2\left[m_0^2 + \left(\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right)\phi_N^2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\sqrt{2}}\,\phi_N\,\phi_S + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\,\phi_S^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_C^2\right], \tag{A34}$$

$$m_{\eta_N}^2 = Z_\pi^2\left[m_0^2 + \left(\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right)\phi_N^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_S^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_C^2 + \frac{c}{2}\,\phi_N^2\,\phi_S^2\,\phi_C^2\right], \tag{A35}$$

$$m_{\eta_S}^2 = Z_{\eta_S}^2\left[m_0^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_N^2 + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\,\phi_S^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_C^2 + \frac{c}{8}\,\phi_N^4\,\phi_C^2\right]. \tag{A36}$$

(ii) Scalar mesons:

$$m_{a_0}^2 = m_0^2 + \left(\lambda_1 + \frac{3}{2}\lambda_2\right)\phi_N^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_S^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_C^2\,, \tag{A37}$$

$$m_{K_0^*}^2 = Z_{K_0^*}^2\left[m_0^2 + \left(\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right)\phi_N^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{\sqrt{2}}\,\phi_N\,\phi_S + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\,\phi_S^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_C^2\right], \tag{A38}$$

$$m_{\sigma_N}^2 = m_0^2 + 3\left(\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right)\phi_N^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_S^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_C^2\,, \tag{A39}$$

$$m_{\sigma_S}^2 = m_0^2 + \lambda_1\phi_N^2 + 3(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\,\phi_S^2 + \lambda_1\,\phi_C^2\ . \tag{A40}$$

(iii) Vector mesons:

$$m_\rho^2 = m_{\omega_N}^2\,, \tag{A41}$$

$$m_{\omega_N}^2 = m_1^2 + 2\,\delta_N + \frac{\phi_N^2}{2}\,(h_1+h_2+h_3) + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_S^2 + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_C^2\,, \tag{A42}$$

$$m_{\omega_S}^2 = m_1^2 + 2\,\delta_S + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_N^2 + \left(\frac{h_1}{2} + h_2 + h_3\right)\phi_S^2 + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_C^2\,, \tag{A43}$$

$$m_{K^*}^2 = m_1^2 + \delta_N + \delta_S + \frac{\phi_N^2}{2}\left(\frac{g_1^2}{2} + h_1 + \frac{h_2}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,\phi_N\,\phi_S\,(h_3 - g_1^2) + \frac{\phi_S^2}{2}(g_1^2 + h_1 + h_2) + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_C^2\ . \tag{A44}$$

(iv) Axial-vector mesons:

$$m_{f_{1N}}^2 = m_{a_1}^2, \tag{A45}$$

$$m_{a_1}^2 = m_1^2 + 2\delta_N + g_1^2\phi_N^2 + \frac{\phi_N^2}{2}(h_1+h_2-h_3) + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_S^2 + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_C^2\,, \tag{A46}$$

$$m_{f_{1S}}^2 = m_1^2 + 2\delta_S + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_N^2 + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_C^2 + 2g_1^2\,\phi_S^2 + \phi_S^2\left(\frac{h_1}{2} + h_2 - h_3\right), \tag{A47}$$

$$m_{K_1}^2 = m_1^2 + \delta_N + \delta_S + \frac{\phi_N^2}{2}\left(\frac{g_1^2}{2} + h_1 + \frac{h_2}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,\phi_N\,\phi_S\,(g_1^2 - h_3) + \frac{\phi_S^2}{2}(g_1^2 + h_1 + h_2) + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_C^2\,, \tag{A48}$$

All previous expressions coincide with Ref. [15] for $h_1 = 0$.
The masses of (open and hidden) charmed mesons are as follows.
(i) Pseudoscalar charmed mesons:

$$m_{\eta_C}^2 = Z_{\eta_C}^2[m_0^2 + \lambda_1\phi_N^2 + \lambda_1\phi_S^2 + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\phi_C^2 + \frac{c}{8}\,\phi_N^4\,\phi_S^2 + 2\,\varepsilon_C]\,, \tag{A49}$$

$$m_D^2 = Z_D^2\left[m_0^2 + \left(\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right)\phi_N^2 + \lambda_1\phi_S^2 - \frac{\lambda_2}{\sqrt{2}}\phi_N\phi_C + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\phi_C^2 + \varepsilon_C\right], \tag{A50}$$

$$m_{D_S}^2 = Z_{D_S}^2[m_0^2 + \lambda_1\phi_N^2 + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\phi_S^2 - \lambda_2\phi_C\phi_S + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\phi_C^2 + \varepsilon_C]\ . \tag{A51}$$

(ii) Scalar charmed mesons:

$$m^2_{\chi_{c0}} = m_0^2 + \lambda_1\phi_N^2 + \lambda_1\phi_S^2 + 3(\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\phi_C^2 + 2\,\varepsilon_C \ , \tag{A52}$$

$$m^2_{D_0^*} = Z^2_{D_0^*}\left[m_0^2 + \left(\lambda_1 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2}\right)\phi_N^2 + \lambda_1\phi_S^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{\sqrt{2}}\phi_C\phi_N + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\phi_C^2 + \varepsilon_C\right] , \tag{A53}$$

$$m^2_{D^*_{S0}} = Z^2_{D_{S0}}[m_0^2 + \lambda_1\phi_N^2 + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\phi_S^2 + \lambda_2\phi_C\phi_S + (\lambda_1+\lambda_2)\phi_C^2 + \varepsilon_C] \ . \tag{A54}$$

(iii) Vector charmed mesons:

$$m^2_{D^*} = m_1^2 + \delta_N + \delta_C + \frac{\phi_N^2}{2}\left(\frac{g_1^2}{2} + h_1 + \frac{h_2}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,\phi_N\,\phi_C(h_3 - g_1^2) + \frac{\phi_C^2}{2}(g_1^2 + h_1 + h_2) + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_S^2 \ , \tag{A55}$$

$$m^2_{J/\psi} = m_1^2 + 2\delta_C + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_N^2 + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_S^2 + \left(\frac{h_1}{2} + h_2 + h_3\right)\phi_C^2 \ , \tag{A56}$$

$$m^2_{D_S^*} = m_1^2 + \delta_S + \delta_C + \frac{\phi_S^2}{2}(g_1^2 + h_1 + h_2) + \phi_S\,\phi_C(h_3 - g_1^2) + \frac{\phi_C^2}{2}(g_1^2 + h_1 + h_2) + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_N^2 \ . \tag{A57}$$

(iv) Axial-vector charmed mesons:

$$m^2_{D_{S1}} = m_1^2 + \delta_S + \delta_C + \frac{\phi_S^2}{2}(g_1^2 + h_1 + h_2) + \phi_S\,\phi_C(g_1^2 - h_3) + \frac{\phi_C^2}{2}(g_1^2 + h_1 + h_2) + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_N^2 \ , \tag{A58}$$

$$m^2_{D_1} = m_1^2 + \delta_N + \delta_C + \frac{\phi_N^2}{2}\left(\frac{g_1^2}{2} + h_1 + \frac{h_2}{2}\right) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,\phi_N\,\phi_C(g_1^2 - h_3) + \frac{\phi_C^2}{2}(g_1^2 + h_1 + h_2) + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_S^2 \ , \tag{A59}$$

$$m^2_{\chi_{c1}} = m_1^2 + 2\delta_C + \frac{h_1}{2}\,\phi_N^2 + \frac{h_1}{2}\phi_S^2 + 2g_1^2\,\phi_C^2 + \phi_C^2\left(\frac{h_1}{2} + h_2 - h_3\right) \ . \tag{A60}$$

Appendix B: Decay widths

1. General formula

The decay width of a particle A decaying into particles B and C has the general expression

$$\Gamma_{A\to BC} = \frac{S_{A\to BC}K(m_A,\,m_B,\,m_C)}{8\pi m_A^2}|\mathcal{M}_{A\to BC}|^2 \ , \tag{B1}$$

where $K(m_A,\,m_B,\,m_C)$ is the modulus of the three-momentum of one of the outgoing particles:

$$K(m_A,\,m_B,\,m_C) = \frac{1}{2m_A}\sqrt{m_A^4 + (m_B^2 - m_C^2)^2 - 2m_A^2\,(m_B^2 + m_C^2)}\theta(m_A - m_B - m_C) \ , \tag{B2}$$

and where $\mathcal{M}_{A\to BC}$ is the corresponding decay amplitude. The quantity $S_{A\to BC}$ refers to a symmetrization factor (it equals 1 if B and C are different and 2 if they are identical).

The decay width of A into three particles B_1, B_2, and B_3 takes the general expression [17]

$$\Gamma_{A\to B_1B_2B_3} = \frac{S_{A\to B_1B_2B_3}}{32(2\pi)^3 m_A^3}\int_{(m_1+m_2)^2}^{(m_A-m_3)^2}\ \int_{(m_{23})_{\rm min}}^{(m_{23})_{\rm max}} |-i\mathcal{M}_{A\to B_1B_2B_3}|^2\,dm_{23}^2\,dm_{12}^2 \ , \tag{B3}$$

where

$$(m_{23})_{\rm min} = (E_2^* + E_3^*)^2 - \left(\sqrt{E_2^{*2} - m_2^2} + \sqrt{E_3^{*2} - m_3^2}\right)^2 \ , \tag{B4}$$

$$(m_{23})_{\rm max} = (E_2^* + E_3^*)^2 - \left(\sqrt{E_2^{*2} - m_2^2} - \sqrt{E_3^{*2} - m_3^2}\right)^2 \ , \tag{B5}$$

and

$$E_2^* = \frac{m_{12}^2 - m_1^2 + m_2^2}{2m_{12}} \ , \ E_3^* = \frac{m_A^2 - m_{12}^2 - m_3^2}{2m_{12}} \ . \tag{B6}$$

The quantities m_1, m_2, m_3 are the masses of B_1, B_2, and B_3, $\mathcal{M}_{A\to B_1B_2B_3}$ is the tree-level decay amplitude, and $S_{A\to B_1B_2B_3}$ is a symmetrization factor (it equals 1 if B_1, B_2, and B_3 are all different, it equals 2 for two identical particles in the final state, and it equals 6 for three identical particles in the final state).

2. Decay widths of charmed scalar mesons

In the scalar sector we report the expressions for the decay widths of D_0^{*0}, D_0^{*+}, and D_{S0}^{*+}.
The scalar state D_0^{*0} decays into $D^0\pi^0$ and $D^+\pi^-$. The explicit expression for the process $D_0^{*0} \to D^0\pi^0$ reads

$$\Gamma_{S\to P_1P_2} = \frac{1}{8\pi m_S}\left[\frac{(m_S^2 - m_{P_1}^2 - m_{P_2}^2)^2 - 4m_{P_2}^2 m_{P_1}^2}{4m_S^4}\right]^{1/2} \left[A_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} + (C_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} + E_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} - B_{D_0^{*0}D\pi}) \times \frac{m_S^2 - m_{P_1}^2 - m_{P_2}^2}{2} + C_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} m_{P_1}^2 + E_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} m_{P_2}^2\right]^2 , \tag{B7}$$

where S, P_1, and P_2 refer to the scalar meson D_0^{*0} and to the pseudoscalar mesons D^0 and π^0 and where

$$A_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} = -\frac{Z_\pi Z_D Z_{D_0^{*0}}}{\sqrt{2}}\,\lambda_2\phi_C, \tag{B8}$$

$$B_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} = \frac{Z_\pi Z_D Z_{D_0^{*0}}}{4}\,w_{a_1}w_{D_1}\left[g_1^2(3\phi_N + \sqrt{2}\phi_C) - 2g_1\frac{w_{a_1} + w_{D_1}}{w_{a_1}w_{D_1}} + h_2(\phi_N + \sqrt{2}\phi_C) - 2h_3\phi_N\right], \tag{B9}$$

$$C_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} = -\frac{Z_\pi Z_D Z_{D_0^{*0}}}{2}w_{D^{\star 0}}w_{D_1}\left[\sqrt{2}ig_1^2\phi_C - g_1\frac{w_{D_1} + iw_{D^{\star 0}}}{w_{D^{\star 0}}w_{D_1}} - \sqrt{2}ih_3\phi_C\right], \tag{B10}$$

$$E_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} = \frac{Z_\pi Z_D Z_{D_0^{*0}}}{4}w_{D^{\star 0}}w_{a_1}\left[ig_1^2(3\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_C) + 2g_1\left(\frac{w_{a_1} - iw_{D^{\star 0}}}{w_{D^{\star 0}}w_{a_1}}\right) + ih_2(\phi_N - \sqrt{2}\phi_C) - 2ih_3\phi_N\right]. \tag{B11}$$

The decay width for $D_0^{*0} \to D^+\pi^-$ has the same expression but is multiplied by an isospin factor 2. The positively charged scalar state D_0^{*+} decays into $D^+\pi^0$ and $D^0\pi^+$. The decay width $D_0^{*+} \to D^+\pi^0$ has the same form as Eq. (B7) upon identifying S, P_1, and P_2 with D_0^{*+}, D^+, and π^0. A similar expression holds for the decay width for $D_0^{*+} \to D^0\pi^+$, where an overall isospin factor 2 is also present.

Finally we turn to the scalar state D_{S0}^{*+} which decays into D^+K^0 and D^0K^+. The decay width $D_{S0}^{*+} \to D^+K^0$ is obtained from Eq. (B7) upon identifying S, P_1, and P_2 with D_{S0}^{*+}, D^+, and K^0 and upon replacing $A_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} \to A_{D_{S0}^*DK}$, $B_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} \to B_{D_{S0}^*DK}$, $C_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} \to C_{D_{S0}^*DK}$, $E_{D_0^{*0}D\pi} \to E_{D_{S0}^*DK}$, where:

$$A_{D_{S0}^*DK} = \frac{Z_K Z_D Z_{D_{S0}^*}}{\sqrt{2}}\lambda_2\left[\phi_N + \sqrt{2}(\phi_S - \phi_C)\right], \tag{B12}$$

$$B_{D_{S0}^*DK} = \frac{Z_K Z_D Z_{D_{S0}^*}}{2}\,w_{K_1}w_{D_1}\left[-\sqrt{2}g_1\frac{w_{K_1} + w_{D_1}}{w_{K_1}w_{D_1}} + \sqrt{2}(g_1^2 - h_3)\phi_N + (g_1^2 + h_2)(\phi_S + \phi_C)\right], \tag{B13}$$

$$C_{D_{S0}^*DK} = \frac{Z_K Z_D Z_{D_{S0}^*}}{2}\,w_{D_1}w_{D_S^\star}\left[\sqrt{2}g_1\frac{w_{D_1} + iw_{D_S^\star}}{w_{D_1}w_{D_S^\star}} - \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(g_1^2 + h_2)\phi_N + i(g_1^2 + h_2)\phi_S + 2i(h_3 - g_1^2)\phi_C\right], \tag{B14}$$

$$E_{D_{S0}^*DK} = \frac{Z_K Z_D Z_{D_{S0}^*}}{2}\,w_{K_1}w_{D_S^\star}\left[\sqrt{2}g_1\frac{w_{K_1} - iw_{D_S^\star}}{w_{K_1}w_{D_S^\star}} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(g_1^2 + h_2)\phi_N + 2i(g_1^2 - h_3)\phi_S - i(g_1^2 + h_2)\phi_C\right]. \tag{B15}$$

The decay of the scalar state D_{S0}^* into D^0K^+ has an analogous analytic expression.

3. Decay widths of charmed vector mesons

The neutral state D^{*0} decays into $D^0\pi^0$. The corresponding expression is:

$$\Gamma_{V\to P_1P_2} = \frac{1}{24\pi}\left[\frac{(m_V^2 - m_{P_1}^2 - m_{P_2}^2)^2 - 4m_{P_1}^2 m_{P_2}^2}{4m_V^4}\right]^{3/2}(A_{D^*D\pi} - B_{D^*D\pi} + C_{D^*D\pi}\,m_V^2)^2\,, \tag{B16}$$

where

$$A_{D^*D\pi} = \frac{i}{2} Z_\pi Z_D \left[g_1 + \sqrt{2} w_{D_1} (h_3 - g_1^2) \phi_C \right] \ , \tag{B17}$$

$$B_{D^*D\pi} = -\frac{i}{4} Z_\pi Z_D \left[2g_1 - w_{a_1}(3g_1^2 + h_2 - 2h_3)\phi_N + \sqrt{2} w_{a_1}(g_1^2 + h_2)\phi_C \right] \ , \tag{B18}$$

$$C_{D^*D\pi} = \frac{i}{2} Z_\pi Z_D w_{a_1} w_{D_1} g_2 \ . \tag{B19}$$

and where V, P_1,and P_2 refer to D^{*0}, D^0, and π^0.

For the decay $D^{*+} \to D^+ \pi^0$ Eq. (B16) holds upon multiplication by an isospin factor 2. .

4. Decay widths of charmed axial-vector mesons

The neutral nonstrange axial-vector meson D_1^0 decays into $D^{*0}\pi^0$, $D^{*+}\pi^-$, $D^0\pi^0\pi^0$, $D^0\pi^+\pi^-$, and $D^-\pi^+\pi^0$. The decay width for $D_1^0 \to D^{*0}\pi^0$ is

$$\Gamma_{A\to VP} = \frac{K(m_A, m_V, m_P)}{12\pi m_A^2} \left[\left| h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} \right|^2 - \frac{\left| h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} k_{A,\mu} \right|^2}{m_A^2} - \frac{\left| h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} k_{V,\nu} \right|^2}{m_V^2} + \frac{\left| h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} k_{A,\mu}\, k_{V,\nu} \right|^2}{m_A^2 m_V^2} \right] \ , \tag{B20}$$

where A, V, and P refer to the mesons D_1^0, D^{*0}, $\pi^0$and $h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi}$ is

$$h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} = i \left\{ A_{D_1 D^*\pi} g^{\mu\nu} + B_{D_1 D^*\pi} [k_V^\mu k_P^\nu + k_P^\mu k_A^\nu - (k_A \cdot k_P) g^{\mu\nu} - (k_V \cdot k_P) g^{\mu\nu}] \right\} \ , \tag{B21}$$

with

$$A_{D_1 D^*\pi} = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} Z_\pi (g_1^2 - h_3) \phi_C \ , \tag{B22}$$

$$B_{D_1 D^*\pi} = \frac{i}{2} Z_\pi g_2 w_{a_1} \ . \tag{B23}$$

The quantities $k_A^\mu = (m_A, \mathbf{0})$, $k_V^\mu = (E_V, \mathbf{k})$, and $k_P^\mu = (E_P, -\mathbf{k})$ are the four-momenta of D_1^0, D^{*0}, and π^0 in the rest frame of D_1^0, respectively. The following kinematic relations hold:

$$\begin{aligned} k_V \cdot k_P &= \frac{m_A^2 - m_V^2 - m_P^2}{2} \, , \\ k_A \cdot k_V &= m_A E_V = \frac{m_A^2 + m_V - m_P^2}{2} \, , \\ k_A \cdot k_P &= m_A E_P = \frac{m_A^2 - m_V + m_P^2}{2} \, . \end{aligned}$$

The terms entering in Eq. (B20) are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \left| h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} \right|^2 = {} & 4A^2_{D_1 D^*\pi} + B^2_{D_1 D^*\pi} \left[m_V^2 m_P^2 + m_A^2 m_P^2 + 2(k_V \cdot k_P)^2 + 2(k_A \cdot k_P)^2 + 6(k_V \cdot k_P)(k_A \cdot k_P) \right] \\ & - 6A_{D_1 D^*\pi} B_{D_1 D^*\pi} (k_V \cdot k_P + k_A \cdot k_P), \end{aligned} \tag{B24}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} k_{A,\mu} \right|^2 = {} & A^2_{D_1 D^*\pi} m_A^2 + B^2_{D_1 D^*\pi} \left[(k_A \cdot k_V)^2 m_P^2 + (k_V \cdot k_P)^2 m_A^2 - 2(k_A \cdot k_V)(k_A \cdot k_P)(k_V \cdot k_P) \right] \\ & + 2A_{D_1 D^*\pi} B_{D_1 D^*\pi} \left[(k_A \cdot k_V)(k_A \cdot k_P) - (k_V \cdot k_P) m_A^2 \right], \end{aligned} \tag{B25}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \left| h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} k_{V,\nu} \right|^2 = {} & A^2_{D_1 D^*\pi} m_V^2 + B^2_{D_1 D^*\pi} \left[(k_A \cdot k_V)^2 m_P^2 + (k_A \cdot k_P)^2 m_V^2 - 2(k_A \cdot k_V)(k_A \cdot k_P)(k_V \cdot k_P) \right] \\ & + 2A_{D_1 D^*\pi} B_{D_1 D^*\pi} \left[(k_A \cdot k_V)(k_V \cdot k_P) - (k_A \cdot k_P) m_V^2 \right] \ , \end{aligned} \tag{B26}$$

$$\left| h^{\mu\nu}_{D_1 D^*\pi} k_{A,\mu} k_{V,\nu} \right|^2 = \left[A_{D_1 D^*\pi} (k_A \cdot k_V) \right]^2$$

with $E_V = \sqrt{K^2(m_A, m_V, m_P) + m_V^2}$ and $E_P = \sqrt{K^2(m_A, m_V, m_P) + m_P^2}$.

The decay width for $D_1^0 \to D^{*+}\pi^-$ is still given by Eq. (B20) upon substituting the fields and upon multiplication by an isospin factor 2.

Now we are turning to the three body-decay of the axial-vector meson D_1^0, which decays into three pseudoscalar mesons ($D\pi\pi$). First, the decay width for $D_1^0 \to D^0\pi^0\pi^0$ can be obtained as

$$\Gamma_{A\to P_1P_2P_3} = \frac{2}{96\,(2\pi)^3\,M^3}\int_{(m_1+m_2)^2}^{(M-m_3)^2}\int_{(m_{23})_{\rm min}}^{(m_{23})_{\rm max}}\left[-\left|h^\mu_{D_1D\pi\pi}\right|^2 + \frac{\left|h^\mu_{D_1D\pi\pi}k_\mu\right|^2}{M^2}\right] dm_{23}^2\, dm_{12}^2\,, \tag{B27}$$

where $h^\mu_{D_1D\pi\pi}$ is the vertex following from the relevant part of the Lagrangian

$$h^\mu_{D_1D\pi\pi} = -\left[A_{D_1D\pi\pi}g^\mu k_1^\mu + B_{D_1D\pi\pi}k_2^\mu\right]\,, \tag{B28}$$

with the coefficients

$$A_{D_1D\pi\pi} = \frac{1}{4}Z_\pi^2\,Z_D\,w_{D_1}(g_1^2 + 2h_1 + h_2)\,, \tag{B29}$$

$$B_{D_1D\pi\pi} = \frac{1}{4}Z_\pi^2\,Z_D\,w_{a_1}(3g_1^2 + h_2 - 2h_3)\,, \tag{B30}$$

and $k^\mu = (M, \mathbf{0})$, $k_1^\mu = (E_{P_1}, \mathbf{k})$, $k_2^\mu = (E_{P_2}, -\mathbf{k})$, and $k_3^\mu = (E_{P_3}, -\mathbf{k})$ are the four-momenta of D_1^0, D^0, π^0, and π^0 in the rest frame of D_1^0, respectively. Using the following kinematic relations

$$\begin{aligned}
k_1\cdot k_2 &= \frac{m_{12}^2 - m_1^2 - m_2^2}{2}\,,\\
k\cdot k_1 &= m_1^2 + \frac{m_{12}^2 - m_1^2 - m_2^2}{2} + \frac{m_{13}^2 - m_1^2 - m_3^2}{2}\,,\\
k\cdot k_2 &= m_2^2 + \frac{m_{12}^2 - m_1^2 - m_2^2}{2} + \frac{m_{23}^2 - m_2^2 - m_3^2}{2}\,,
\end{aligned}$$

where the quantities M, m_1, m_2, m_3 are the masses of D_1^0, D^0, π^0, π^0, respectively. The decay of the scalar state $D_1^+ \to D^+\pi^0\pi^0$ has an analogous analytic expression. The decay of the scalar states $D_1^0 \to D^0\pi^+\pi^-$ and $D_1^+ \to D^0\pi^+\pi^-$ have the same formula as presented in Eq. (B27) but multiplied by an isospin factor 2 as given by the Lagrangian (6).

The decay width $D_1^0 \to D^+\pi^-\pi^0$ reads

$$\Gamma_{A\to P_1P_2P_3} = \frac{F_{D_1D\pi\pi}^2}{96\,(2\pi)^3\,M^3}\int_{(m_1+m_2)^2}^{(M-m_3)^2}\int_{(m_{23})_{\rm min}}^{(m_{23})_{\rm max}}\left[\frac{|k\cdot k_2 - k\cdot k_3|^2}{M^2} - (m_2^2 + m_3^2 + 2k_2\cdot k_3)\right] dm_{23}^2\, dm_{12}^2\,, \tag{B31}$$

where the quantities A, P_1, P_2, and P_3 refer to the fields D_1^0, D^+, π^-, and π^0, respectively. Moreover:

$$F_{D_1D\pi\pi} = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}Z_\pi^2\,Z_D\,w_{a_1}(g_1^2 - h_2 - 2h_3)\,, \tag{B32}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
k_2\cdot k_3 &= \frac{m_{23}^2 - m_2^2 - m_3^2}{2}\,,\\
k\cdot k_3 &= m_3^2 + \frac{m_{13}^2 - m_1^2 - m_3^2}{2} + \frac{m_{23}^2 - m_2^2 - m_3^2}{2}\,.
\end{aligned}$$

The charged state D_1^+ decays into $D^{*+}\pi^0$, $D^{*0}\pi^+$, $D^+\pi^0\pi^0$, $D^+\pi^+\pi^-$, and $D^0\pi^0\pi^+$. Analogous expressions hold.

As a last step we turn to the strange-charmed axial-vector state D_{S1}^+. It decays predominantly into the channels $D^{*+}K^0$ and $D^{*0}K^+$. The formula for the decay width $\Gamma_{D_{S1}^+\to D^{*+}K^0}$ and $\Gamma_{D_{S1}^+\to D^{*0}K^0}$ is as in Eq. (B20) upon replacing the fields:

$$h^{\mu\nu}_{D_{S1}D^*K} = i\left\{A_{D_{S1}D^*K}g^{\mu\nu} + B_{D_{S1}D^*K}[P_1^\mu P_2^\nu + P_2^\mu P^\nu - (P\cdot P_2)g^{\mu\nu} - (P_1\cdot P_2)g^{\mu\nu}]\right\}\,, \tag{B33}$$

where

$$A_{D_{S1}D^*K} = \frac{i}{4} Z_K \left[g_1^2(\sqrt{2}\phi_N - 2\phi_S - 4\phi_C) + h_2(\sqrt{2}\phi_N - 2\phi_S) + 4h_3\phi_C \right], \tag{B34}$$

$$B_{D_{S1}D^*K} = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} Z_K \, g_2 w_{K_1}. \tag{B35}$$

[1] S. Gasiorowicz and D. A. Geffen, Rev. Mod. Phys. **41** (1969) 531.
[2] U. G. Meissner, Phys. Rept. **161** (1988) 213.
[3] C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **234** (1984) 173; L. Giusti and S. Necco, JHEP **0704** (2007) 090 [arXiv:hep-lat/0702013].
[4] R. D. Pisarski and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. D **29** (1984) 338.
[5] G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. D **14** (1976) 3432; G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rev. Lett. **37** (1976) 8; G. 't Hooft, Phys. Rept. **142** (1986) 357.
[6] J. S. Schwinger, Annals Phys. **2** (1957) 407; M. Gell-Mann and M. Levy, Nuovo Cim. **16** (1960) 705; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18** (1967) 188.
[7] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Annals Phys. **158** (1984) 142; see also S. Scherer, Adv. Nucl. Phys. **27** (2003) 277 [arXiv:hep-ph/0210398] and refs. therein.
[8] M. Bando, T. Kugo and K. Yamawaki, Phys. Rept. **164** (1988) 217; G. Ecker, J. Gasser, A. Pich and E. de Rafael, Nucl. Phys. B **321** (1989) 311; E. E. Jenkins, A. V. Manohar and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75** (1995) 2272 [arXiv:hep-ph/9506356]; C. Terschlusen and S. Leupold, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **67** (2012) 401 [arXiv:1111.4907 [hep-ph]].
[9] J. S. Schwinger, Phys. Lett. B **24** (1967) 473; S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **166** (1968) 1568.
[10] P. Ko and S. Rudaz, Phys. Rev. D **50** (1994) 6877.
[11] M. Urban, M. Buballa and J. Wambach, Nucl. Phys. A **697** (2002) 338 [hep-ph/0102260].
[12] D. Parganlija, F. Giacosa and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 054024 [arXiv:1003.4934 [hep-ph]].
[13] S. Gallas, F. Giacosa and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 014004 [arXiv:0907.5084 [hep-ph]].
[14] S. Janowski, D. Parganlija, F. Giacosa and D.H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 054007 [arXiv:1103.3238 [hep-ph]].
[15] D. Parganlija, P. Kovacs, G. Wolf, F. Giacosa and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 014011 [arXiv:1208.0585 [hep-ph]].
[16] C. Rosenzweig, A. Salomone and J. Schechter, Phys. Rev. D **24** (1981) 2545; A. Salomone, J. Schechter and T. Tudron, Phys. Rev. D **23** (1981) 1143; C. Rosenzweig, A. Salomone and J. Schechter, Nucl. Phys. B **206** (1982) 12 [Erratum-ibid. B 207 (1982) 546]; A. A. Migdal and M. A. Shifman, Phys. Lett. B **114** (1982) 445; H. Gomm and J. Schechter, Phys. Lett. B **158**(1985) 449; R. Gomm, P. Jain, R. Johnson and J. Schechter, Phys. Rev. D **33** (1986) 801.
[17] J. Beringer *et al.* (particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 010001.
[18] M. Neubert, Phys. Rept. **245** (1994) 259 [hep-ph/9306320]; R. Casalbuoni, A. Deandrea, N. Di Bartolomeo, R. Gatto, F. Feruglio and G. Nardulli, Phys. Rept. **281** (1997) 145 [hep-ph/9605342]; H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **240** (1990) 447; H. Georgi, HUTP-91-A039. F. De Fazio, In *Shifman, M. (ed.): *At the frontier of particle physics*, vol. 3 1671-1717 [hep-ph/0010007]; H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **240** (1990) 447; M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. D **45** (1992) 2188; E. E. Kolomeitsev and M. F. M. Lutz, Phys. Lett. B **582** (2004) 39 [hep-ph/0307133].
[19] S. Godfrey and I. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **32** (1985) 189; S. Godfrey and R. Kokoski, Phys. Rev. D **43** (1991) 1679.
[20] S. Capstrick and N. Isgur, Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986) 2809; N. Isgur and M. B. Wise, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66** (1991) 1130; E. J. Eichten, T. Hill and C. Quigg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** (1994) 4116; E. J. Eichten, T. Hill and C. Quigg, FERMILAB-CONF-94/118-T; Z. Maki and I. Umemura, Prog. Theor. Phys. **59** (1978) 507; J. Segovia, D. R. Entem and F. Fernandez, arXiv:1301.2592 [hep-ph]; L. Cao, Y. -C. Yang and H. Chen, Few Body Syst. **53** (2012) 327 [arXiv:1206.3008 [hep-ph]].
[21] G. S. Bali, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **21** (2006) 5610 [hep-lat/0608004]; G. C. Donald, C. T. H. Davies, R. J. Dowdall, E. Follana, K. Hornbostel, J. Koponen, G. P. Lepage and C. McNeile, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012) 094501 [arXiv:1208.2855 [hep-lat]]; M. Kalinowski and M. Wagner, PoS ConfinementX (2012) 303 [arXiv:1212.0403 [hep-lat]].
[22] W. A. Bardeen and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **49** (1994) 409 [hep-ph/9304265]; W. A. Bardeen, E. J. Eichten and C. T. Hill, Phys. Rev. D **68** (2003) 054024 [hep-ph/0305049].
[23] M. A. Nowak, M. Rho and I. Zahed, Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993) 4370 [hep-ph/9209272]; M. A. Nowak, M. Rho and I. Zahed, Acta Phys. Polon. B **35** (2004) 2377 [hep-ph/0307102]; C. Sasaki, arXiv:1409.3420 [hep-ph].
[24] M. F. M. Lutz and M. Soyeur, Nucl. Phys. A **813** (2008) 14 [arXiv:0710.1545 [hep-ph]].
[25] N. Brambilla, S. Eidelman, B. K. Heltsley, R. Vogt, G. T. Bodwin, E. Eichten, A. D. Frawley and A. B. Meyer *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **71** (2011) 1534 [arXiv:1010.5827 [hep-ph]].
[26] D. Mohler and R. M. Woloshyn, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 054505 [arXiv:1103.5506 [hep-lat]]; G. Moir, M. Peardon, S. M. Ryan, C. E. Thomas and L. Liu, JHEP **1305** (2013) 021 [arXiv:1301.7670 [hep-ph]].
[27] M. Wagner and M. Kalinowski, arXiv:1310.5513 [hep-lat]; M. Kalinowski and M. Wagner, Acta Phys. Polon. Supp. **6** (2013) 991 [arXiv:1304.7974 [hep-lat]].
[28] D. Ebert, R. N. Faustov and V. O. Galkin, Eur. Phys. J. C **66** (2010) 197 [arXiv:0910.5612 [hep-ph]].
[29] D. Parganlija, *Quarkonium Phenomenology in Vacuum*, PhD Thesis (2012) [arXiv:1208.0204 [hep-ph]].

[30] D. Parganlija, F. Giacosa, P. Kovacs and G. Wolf, AIP Conf. Proc. **1343** (2011) 328 [arXiv:1011.6104 [hep-ph]]; D. Parganlija, F. Giacosa, D. H. Rischke, P. Kovacs and G. Wolf, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **26** (2011) 607 [arXiv:1009.2250 [hep-ph]]; D. Parganlija, Acta Phys. Polon. Supp. **4** (2011) 727 [arXiv:1105.3647 [hep-ph]].

[31] F. Giacosa, Phys. Rev. D **80** (2009) 074028 [arXiv:0903.4481 [hep-ph]]; F. Giacosa, AIP Conf. Proc. **1322** (2010) 223 [arXiv:1010.1021[hep-ph]].

[32] C. Amsler and N. A. Tornqvist, Phys. Rept. **389** (2004) 61; E. Klemt and A. Zaitsev, Phys. Rept. **454** (2007) 1 [arXiv: 0708.4016[hep-ph]].

[33] C. Amsler and F. E. Close, Phys. Rev. D **53** (1996) 295 [arXiv:hep-ph/9507326]; W. J. Lee and D. Weingarten, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 014015 [arXiv:hep-lat/9910008]; F. E. Close and A. Kirk, Eur. Phys. J. C **21** (2001) 531 [arXiv:hep-ph/0103173]; F. Giacosa, T. Gutsche, V. E. Lyubovitskij and A. Faessler, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 094006 [arXiv:hep-ph/0509247]; F. Giacosa, T. Gutsche, V. E. Lyubovitskij and A. Faessler, Phys. Lett. B **622** (2005) 277 [arXiv:hep-ph/0504033]; F. Giacosa, T. Gutsche and A. Faessler, Phys. Rev. C **71** (2005) 025202 [arXiv:hep-ph/0408085]; F. Giacosa and G. Pagliara, Nucl. Phys. A **833** (2010) 138 [arXiv:0905.3706 [hep-ph]].

[34] S. Janowski, F. Giacosa and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) 11, 114005 [arXiv:1408.4921 [hep-ph]].

[35] I. Caprini, G. Colangelo and H. Leutwyler, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96** (2006) 132001 [hep-ph/0512364]; F. J. Yndurain, R. Garcia-Martin and J. R. Pelaez, Phys. Rev. D **76** (2007) 074034 [hep-ph/0701025]; H. Leutwyler, AIP Conf. Proc. **1030** (2008) 46 [arXiv:0804.3182 [hep-ph]]; R. Kaminski, R. Garcia-Martin, P. Grynkiewicz and J. R. Pelaez, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **186** (2009) 318 [arXiv:0811.4510 [hep-ph]]; R. Garcia-Martin, R. Kaminski, J. R. Pelaez and J. Ruiz de Elvira, Phys. Rev. Lett. **107** (2011) 072001 [arXiv:1107.1635 [hep-ph]].

[36] D. V. Bugg, Eur. Phys. J. C **52** (2007) 55 [arXiv:0706.1341 [hep-ex]].

[37] D. Black, A. H. Fariborz and J. Schechter, Phys. Rev. D **61** (2000) 074001 [hep-ph/9907516]; A. H. Fariborz, R. Jora and J. Schechter, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 034006 [arXiv:0707.0843 [hep-ph]]; A. H. Fariborz, R. Jora and J. Schechter, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 074014 [arXiv:0902.2825 [hep-ph]]; A. H. Fariborz, R. Jora, J. Schechter and M. N. Shahid, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 113004 [arXiv:1106.4538 [hep-ph]]; T. K. Mukherjee, M. Huang and Q. -S. Yan, arXiv:1203.5717 [hep-ph].

[38] F. Giacosa, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007) 054007 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611388].

[39] F. -K. Guo, C. Hanhart and U. -G. Meissner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 242004 [arXiv:0904.3338 [hep-ph]]; L. Liu, K. Orginos, F. -K. Guo, C. Hanhart and U. -G. Meissner, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 014508 [arXiv:1208.4535 [hep-lat]]; F. -K. Guo, C. Hanhart and U. -G. Meissner, Eur. Phys. J. A **40** (2009) 171 [arXiv:0901.1597 [hep-ph]].

[40] E. Klempt, hep-ph/0404270.

[41] F. Divotgey, L. Olbrich and F. Giacosa, Eur. Phys. J. A **49** (2013) 135 [arXiv:1306.1193 [hep-ph]]; H. -Y. Cheng, Phys. Rev. D **67** (2003) 094007 [hep-ph/0301198]; H. Hatanaka and K. -C. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 074007 [arXiv:0808.3731 [hep-ph]]; A. Ahmed, I. Ahmed, M. Ali Paracha and A. Rehman, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 033010 [arXiv:1105.3887 [hep-ph]]; X. Liu, Z. -T. Zou and Z. -J. Xiao, arXiv:1404.2089 [hep-ph].

[42] T. Gutsche, T. Branz, A. Faessler, I. W. Lee and V. E. Lyubovitskij, arXiv:1001.1870 [hep-ph]; T. Gutsche and V. E. Lyubovitskij, AIP Conf. Proc. **1322** (2010) 289; T. Gutsche and V. E. Lyubovitskij, AIP Conf. Proc. **1257** (2010) 385; M. Cleven, F. -K. Guo, C. Hanhart and U. -G. Meissner, Eur. Phys. J. A **47** (2011) 19 [arXiv:1009.3804 [hep-ph]]; F. -K. Guo, P. -N. Shen and H. -C. Chiang, Phys. Lett. B **647** (2007) 133 [hep-ph/0610008].

[43] J. Bartelt and S. Shukla, Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **45** (1995) 133-161.

[44] F. Giacosa, D. Parganlija, P. Kovacs and G. Wolf, EPJ Web Conf. **37** (2012) 08006 [arXiv:1208.6202 [hep-ph]].

[45] C. Morningstar and M. J. Peardon, AIP Conf. Proc. **688** (2004) 220 [arXiv:nucl-th/0309068]; M. Loan, X. Q. Luo and Z. H. Luo, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **21** (2006) 2905 [arXiv:hep-lat/0503038]; E. B. Gregory, A. C. Irving, C. C. McNeile, S. Miller and Z. Sroczynski, PoS **LAT2005** (2006) 027 [arXiv:hep-lat/0510066]; Y. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **73** (2006) 014516 [arXiv:hep-lat/0510074]; C. M. Richards *et al.* [UKQCD Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 034501 [arXiv:1005.2473 [hep-lat]].

[46] W. I. Eshraim, S. Janowski, F. Giacosa and D. H. Rischke, Phys. Rev. D **87** (2013) 054036 [arXiv:1208.6474 [hep-ph]]; W. I. Eshraim, S. Janowski, A. Peters, K. Neuschwander and F. Giacosa, Acta Phys. Polon. Supp. **5** (2012) 1101 [arXiv:1209.3976 [hep-ph]]; W. I. Eshraim and S. Janowski, PoS ConfinementX (2012) 118 [arXiv:1301.3345 [hep-ph]]; W. I. Eshraim and S. Janowski, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **426** (2013) 012018 [arXiv:1211.7323 [hep-ph]].

[47] M. Gell-Mann, R. J. Oakes and B. Renner, Phys. Rev. **175** (1968) 2195.

[48] W. I. Eshraim, PoS QCD **-TNT-III** (2014) 049 [arXiv:1401.3260 [hep-ph]].

[49] A. Mishra, E. L. Bratkovskaya, J. Schaffner-Bielich, S. Schramm and H. Stoecker, Phys. Rev. C **69** (2004) 015202 [nucl-th/0308082].

[50] F. O. Gottfried and S. P. Klevansky, Phys. Lett. B **286** (1992) 221.

[51] N. N. Achasov and A. V. Kiselev, Phys. Rev. D **70** (2004) 111901 [hep-ph/0405128]; F. Giacosa and G. Pagliara, Phys. Rev. C **76** (2007) 065204 [arXiv:0707.3594 [hep-ph]]; F. Giacosa and T. Wolkanowski, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **27** (2012) 1250229 [arXiv:1209.2332 [hep-ph]].

[52] CLEO Collaboration (K.W. Edwards et al.), Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 30.

[53] N. G. Deshpande and J. Trampetic, Phys. Lett. B **339** (1994) 270.

[54] M. Boglione and M. R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 114010; E. van Beveren, T. A. Rijken, K. Metzger, C. Dullemond, G. Rupp and J. E. Ribeiro, Z. Phys. C **30** (1986) 615; E. van Beveren, D. V. Bugg, F. Kleefeld and G. Rupp, Phys. Lett. B **641** (2006) 265 [hep-ph/0606022].

[55] S. Coito, G. Rupp and E. van Beveren, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 094020 [arXiv:1106.2760 [hep-ph]]; G. Rupp, S. Coito and E. van Beveren, Acta Phys. Polon. Supp. **5** (2012) 1007 [arXiv:1209.1475 [hep-ph]].

[56] D. Parganlija, F. Giacosa, P. Kovacs and G. Wolf, AIP Conf. Proc. **1343** (2011) 328 [arXiv:1011.6104 [hep-ph]].